A CHRISTIAN APOLOGY.

A CHRISTIAN APOLOGY

BY

PAUL SCHANZ, D.D., D.PH.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF TÜBINGEN,

TRANSLATED BY

REV. MICHAEL F. GLANCEY,

INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS IN THE DIOCESE OF BIRMINGHAM,

AND

REV. VICTOR J. SCHOBEL, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY AT ST. MARY'S, OSCOTT.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. II: GOD AND REVELATION.

FIFTH REVISED EDITION.

Frederick Pustet & Co.

Printers to The Holy Apostolic See and The Sacred Congregation of Rites

RATISBON ROME NEW YORK CINCINNATI

TRANSLATORS' PREFACE.

The present volume deals mainly with the vital problems that have been raised in recent years by the sciences of Biblical Criticism and Comparative History of Religions. The author's method of treatment will, we trust, commend itself to every one who is alive to the prominent part played by the latter science in relation to the former.

The tendency of modern Biblical Criticism is extremely Rationalistic. It aims at undermining the whole economy of supernatural revelation, by destroying the historical and authentic character of Holy Scripture, and chiefly of the Old Testament. With such results we Catholics are, of course, deeply concerned; but Protestants, by their very position, are concerned far more deeply. The Protestant rule of faith is itself in jeopardy. And Protestants, here in England at any rate, have not been slow to recognize this fact. They were the first to observe the rising dust of the hostile advance, and they set about preparing what purport to be plans of defence, but which we feel bound to consider as terms of surrender. Among other efforts in this direction, we refer especially to three. 'Inspiration and the Bible,' by R. Horton; London: Fisher

Unwin, 1889. 'The Holy Spirit and Inspiration,' an Essay by Charles Gore in *Lux Mundi;* London: Murray, 1890. 'The Oracles of God,' Nine Lectures by W. Sandy; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1891.

Now it is almost an essential note of these recent Protestant Apologetics that, while attempting to save a supernatural element in Scripture as a book containing divine revelations, they should allow so large a measure of success to the attacks which have been directed against the historical element, as to leave the revealed element defenceless. We are told that the results of Biblical Criticism, especially in regard to the Old Testament, must be frankly accepted by all Christians, as they have already been accepted by the best leaders of religious thought; that Anglicans have already made, not without encouragement from the highest quarters, a complete change of front, which now only awaits a fuller and wider recognition.[1] With the nature of that change we are not here interested; nor shall we criticise it further than to ask:

> "What boots it at one gate to make defence,
> "And at another to let in the foe?"

It is equally characteristic of the writers already named, to comprise the whole controversy under the title of 'The Inspiration of Scripture,' whereas inspiration, in the Catholic meaning of the word, is involved only remotely, and by way of conse-

1 Sandy l.c. p. 5-7. 103. Note.

quence. By reason of this confusion between inspiration and revelation, between things inspired and things revealed, Protestant Apologists have been gradually driven into a hopeless and fatal position. For, assuming the principle that whatever is revealed is inspired, and whatever is not revealed is not inspired, and then being compelled, by the cogency of evident facts, to confess that there is much in Scripture, which was not revealed, they are now bound to allow that there is much in Scripture, which was not inspired. Two practical results of supreme importance have followed. First, the strong and effective barrier of inspiration has been thrown down, behind which the Catholic church has ever sheltered revelation, and all the rich domain of revealed truth lies open and exposed to the consuming ravages of doubt. And next, the practical utility of Scripture, as an assured teacher of truth, has received its death-wound. It has now become imperative to distinguish between the two elements of Scripture—the inspired and the uninspired—the divine and the human—but this is a task that defies the wit both of men and angels.

It has happened here, as it has not unfrequently happened elsewhere, that time-honoured words should be current when the ideas which they first embodied have either changed or disappeared. A familiar instance of this may be seen in the device resorted to by impoverished governments, who, while retaining the normal denomination of coin,

replenish their empty coffers by debasing its material. A similar process is constantly taking place in the world of thought and language. For an idea may contract or expand without any corresponding alteration in the formula by which it was originally expressed; and thus it comes about that party-cries and watchwords, upon which the very life of nations once turned, may, after a few generations, be found still holding their position though now with a largely altered meaning; and men, by the mere possession of outward similarity of name, are often deluded into the belief that they possess real continuity of thought and principle. We have referred to this well-known phenomenon, partly in explanation of the strange use often made of the words 'Inspiration' and 'Revelation,' and partly as a help to the English reader. These two words will, in the following pages, be frequently met with, and different classes of readers may attach to them widely different ideas. It would be a misfortune were this to happen. We shall endeavour, therefore, to explain as clearly as we can the sense in which 'Revelation' and 'Inspiration' are taken by Catholic Theologians, and which they bear in the present volume. Not to be clear on this point is to be exposed to serious error.

The term 'Revelation,' then, is employed by Catholic Theologians, first, in an active and subjective sense, to denote the act whereby God immediately makes certain truths known to man; and, secondly,

in a passive and objective sense, for the sum of truths so communicated. Both senses, it is evident, are indissolubly connected by mutual and necessary implication. Now the truths which go to make up objective revelation, cannot be all referred on intrinsic grounds to the same class. Some, by their very character, are altogether beyond the reach of human thought, either because, like the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, they are essentially mysteries, or because, like the fact of the existence of Angels, or the bestowal of a Divine Sonship upon man, or the reserved reward of a Beatific Vision, they are positive points completely dependent upon the free and hidden will of God; and, for the simple reason that they do so depend, they are, without a divine manifestation, quite unknowable. The revelation of such deeply-hidden truths is, absolutely and in the strictest sense, called supernatural revelation; for not only the manner in which we come to be possessed of them is supernatural, but the truths themselves belong to a sphere so far beyond that in which the mind of man naturally moves, that they cannot by him be brought under the natural play and action of his intelligence. Other revealed truths there are, however, which fall well within the sweep of man's native powers; as, for instance, facts of nature or history, and the broad principles of natural morality and religion contained in the Decalogue. Such truths belong to a revelation that is supernatural only relatively. In their substance

they are natural truths, discoverable by the ordinary light of reason; but they are yet classed with the supernatural on the ground that, having in point of fact been made known immediately by God, and so coming to man not by the natural avenues of his knowledge, they are supernatural in the manner of their manifestation. Hence, though the act of immediate revelation is absolutely and always supernatural, the truths revealed may be supernatural both in themselves and in their manifestation, or solely in their manifestation.

Those to whom God's revelation is originally made, are called Organs of Revelation. Now it is quite true that, in a general sense, the recipients of revelation and the message they receive may be, and are commonly said to be, inspired; but we must not lose sight of the fact that, in so terming them, we are prescinding from the specific concept of inspiration. An inspired book—for here we have to deal exclusively with books—means something else than a book containing divine revelation, even though there be nothing in the book but what has been divinely revealed. The recipient of God's words might, of his own accord, write down, and that too, most faithfully, the truths mysteriously communicated by God; and inasmuch as such a record would contain divine truth, it would doubtless be a divine book; not for that, however, would the volume be inspired. For the inspiration of a book it is required that the divine message should have been given with a view

to its subsequent transmission by writing—when, consequently, the writer has been moved to write by the special command and influence of God, who then owes it to Himself to guide and assist such a one, by enlightening his mind, directing his will, and efficaciously preserving him from error in the message. Thus inspiration does not directly and immediately fall upon the material contents, but on their formal enunciation in writing. In this view of the matter, it is quite plain that revelation is not identical with inspiration, and that a book may contain revealed truth, while yet failing to be an inspired book.

And now the converse question arises, may a book be inspired even in those parts which contain matters not revealed? If it be maintained that inspiration necessarily includes revelation, and that a book cannot be inspired unless its contents have been revealed, then, in truth, the whole question of inspiration, as a special question distinct form that of revelation, loses all practical importance. For, on the supposition that the contents of an inspired book must essentially be revealed, those contents already possess, by reason of their divine origin, a divine authority; and what greater authority could we desire? If, however, the book that is inspired need not be restricted to revealed contents, we are met, at the very threshold of our enquiry, by consequences of the supremest importance. It is, at least in idea, supposable, that God should choose

for his messenger a man of ripe experience—one whose mind is already stored with a rich treasury of truth, the fruit of long earnest study and observation—and by an altogether special impulse should lead him to write down his thoughts for a definite purpose by Him intended, and should securely guide him to the exact and faithful performance of the task. Would not God, in such a case, make the lessons of the book *just as much His own* as if the writer's mind had been a blank, and all his knowledge were immediately due to a divine outpouring? Does not the sculptor create the image even when he has carved it with borrowed instruments? But if any one contend that, to secure true inspiration God must reveal, as it were afresh, the contents of the book, we can only reply, that we need strong proof to make us accept what it is unnatural to expect, that inspiration is an inward influence of which he can have had no personal experience, and that Christian doctrine gives him no warrant for his contention. As a matter of theory, therefore, it is quite possible for a message to be inspired, even though the contents of such message were known to the writer before the inspiration to write descended upon him.

Now, what appears to be possible in theory is shown, by an examination of Scripture, to be actually the fact. In the Bible there are books whose contents comprise truths and facts unquestionably taken from the writer's own stores of knowledge;

there are other truths and facts, again, which might have been revealed, but which yet may not have been revealed, and which lie side by side with truths that were revealed—and all of them—revealed, unrevealed, and doubtful—are closely interwoven so as to form the texture of one story that is complete and organically whole. This story, we maintain, is inspired, not merely in the gross, scope, and substance, but in all its parts and entirety. We hold, therefore, that the character of the contents, as revealed or unrevealed, has no direct bearing on the question of their inspiration. Of course, where the contents have evidently been revealed to the writer, they may fairly be taken as affording presumptive evidence of inspiration in the writing; but they are far from being conclusive on this point. The presence of revealed matter is not a perfect proof of inspiration, neither is the presence of unrevealed matter a perfect disproof. To establish the fact of inspiration we require evidence altogether special. This is the assured teaching of the Catholic Church. "If any "one shall not receive as sacred and canonical the "Books of Holy Scripture, entire with all their "parts, as the Holy Synod of Trent has enumerated "them, or shall deny that they have been divinely "inspired; let him be anathema." And again, "these books of the Old and New Testament are to "be received as sacred and canonical, in their "integrity, with all their parts, . . These the "Church holds to be sacred and canonical; not

"because, having been carefully composed by mere "human industry, they were afterwards approved by "her authority; *nor merely because they contain "revelation*, with no admixture of error; but because, "having been *written by the inspiration* of the Holy "Ghost, they have God for their author, and have "been delivered as such to the Church herself." [Vatican Council Sess. iii. can. ii. cap. ii.]

It must not be supposed, however, that between revelation and inspiration there is no connexion. If there had been no revelation, neither would there have been any inspiration; if there had been no revealed truths to protect, we should have had no inspired writers. Inspiration came for the sake of revelation, and it was solely on behalf of revealed truth that inspiration laid hold of truths that were not revealed. For, after all, such unrevealed facts and truths, though patent to our natural sight and observation, do have a real bearing upon revelation and the supernatural providence of God. Such are the historical facts of the Bondage in Egypt and the Babylonian Captivity. Now it is this precise bearing that the inspired writer makes known; this it is which gives their shape and character to the narratives of sacred history, and altogether lifts them above the plane of profane history even when the latter is recording the same material events. In the expressive words of a German scholar, what might have been a history of man, is the history of the kingdom of God. In other words, the whole purpose

of the inspired writer is directly religious and supernatural; and the story being set amid the refulgent glow of that purpose, grows luminous and reflects throughout a supernatural and divine light. Hence the Vatican Council (l.c.), when speaking of the supernatural revelation, simply said: "This supernatural revelation, according to the universal belief "of the Church, is contained in the written books "(Scripture) and unwritten traditions." It would have been alien from the spirit and scope of this decree for the Council to have attempted a separation of Scripture into parts revealed and parts unrevealed. All the parts are sacred and canonical; whether the particular truths be revealed or not, they all possess an equal authority of inspiration. That authority is a divine authority, and is evenly binding throughout.

There remains yet another question that equally affects, though not in the same precise way, both revelation and inspiration. The question is this: Considering that the revealed and inspired word of God has come to man through the medium of his fellows; that it has been put in the form of human speech, and adapted to our mental capacity; considering, further, that man's best speech and thoughts are inherently defective, and far from perfection;—what degree of inevitable human defect in the messenger may be allowed by God, and may be compatible with the full safety of the revealed or inspired message? Rude and unpolished lan-

guage? Ungrammatical forms? Debased literary taste? A host of similar, or more serious questions, will immediately occur to the reader. This point has been discussed by Theologians under the title of "De Extensione Inspirationis." This title we cannot but consider as very misleading. Inspiration extends to all the books, "in their integrity, with all their parts." We cling to this doctrine with all the strength and tenacity of our soul, for we feel that, if once we relax our hold of this, we shall be swept away by a flood. We prefer, therefore, to put the question in the form already proposed:—How far are human defects, and which, compatible with the perfect truth and safety of a revealed or fully inspired message? What limitations of thought and language will weaken the claim to that trustworthiness which we demand in an inspired writer, and render his statement unfit to be the medium of a divine communication? In other words, what materials must be considered unsuitable, and so be rejected by God in the execution of His plan to build up for us a strong home and shelter-house of absolutely reliable truth? As a broad solution we would say that, in the case of revelation—where the absolute security of a precise truth or exact fact is paramount—no defect is admissible that would in any way impair our full reliance on the perfect accuracy of the message. In the case of inspired, but unrevealed, contents which, as we have said, are written for their bearing upon revelation and the

divine purpose, every defect must be repudiated that would weaken the link between fact and purpose, or tend to throw the slightest discredit upon the truth of the whole revelation. In consequence, we stand by the canon of St. Augustine: "I have learned to yield this respect and honour only to the canonical books of Scripture: of these alone do I most firmly believe that the authors were completely free from error. For it seems to me that most disastrous consequences must follow upon our believing that anything false is found in the sacred books. . . . For if you once admit into such a high sanctuary of authority one false statement . , . there will not be left a single sentence of those books which, if appearing to any one difficult in practice or hard to believe, may not by the same fatal rule be explained away."[2] For a more detailed answer to the several points comprised in the question, we must refer to our author's pages.

From what has been so far discussed, it is clear that, for the Catholic Apologist to expect help from recent Protestant defenders of Scripture, would be to trust to a broken reed. Their whole plan of defence is wrong in principle, and based on a fatal misconception. Davids, as we believe them to be, in zeal and spirit, they have gone out to the combat in the armour and with the weapons of Goliath. They have already given to the Critical School what was essential to that which they wish to retain,

2 Ep. 82 ad Hier. n. 3; 28 ad Hier. n. 3. Clark's Translation.

but not before what remains had been rendered scarcely worth keeping. For inspiration and revelation have been exposed to the action of dissolvents so powerful that almost every trace of the supernatural has been eaten away. In justification of these severe strictures we submit a brief analysis of the earnest and thoughtful essay written by the esteemed Editor of "Lux Mundi." We select this, because of the very prominent place it has won and the attention it has so widely attracted.

The Essay is divided into two parts that are sufficiently indicated by the title. The first part is one of principle, the second part makes the application to Scripture. With that application we are little concerned. We shall judge of the principles on their own merits. They are certainly broad and comprehensive. Mr. GORE reviews the action of the Holy Spirit from the beginning of the world even until now. That action is considered in its bearings upon creation in general, and upon man in particular. But we must let the writer speak for himself, only premising that the italics in the various passages are ours.

1. "Nature is one great body, and there is "breath in the body; but this breath is not self-"originated life, it is the influence of the Divine "Spirit." (Gen. I. 2; coll. Ps. xxxiii. 6; civ. 29, 30.) This, of course, is the common doctrine that God is the creative Spirit who sustains in life and being all the creatures of His hand.

2. "And yet, because His special attribute is "holiness, it is in *rational* creatures which alone are "capable of holiness, that He exerts His special "influence. A special inbreathing of the Divine "Spirit gave to man *his proper being*. (Gen. II. "7.) In humanity, made after the Divine image, "it was the original intention of God that the Spirit "should find His chiefest joy, building the edifice of "a social life in which *nature* was to find its crown "and justification: a life of conscious and free "*sonship*, in which the gifts of God should be not "only received, but recognized as His, and con-"sciously used in willing and glad homage to the "Divine Giver, in reverent execution of the law of "development impressed by the Divine reason, in "the realized fellowship of the Blessed Spirit of "knowledge and love." The whole drift of this passage warns us to be on our guard, for we are treading on dangerous ground. The writer mentions, indeed, "holiness," sonship," and "special influence,' which are Christian terms belonging to the sphere of the supernatural, but which will also bear a wider interpretation, and so cease to be specifically Christian. It is by no means clear from the words themselves, either what action of the Holy Spirit is meant, or in what way the special influence is special. As far as the words go, we have not got beyond the limits of what is known as natural religion, nor, to speak truth, will the context allow us to advance beyond them. The

author is absolutely silent as to the supernatural character of man's original state, when there was not only a most appropriate and favourable opportunity for making mention of this, but even at the precise point when such mention was imperatively demanded, for it is absolutely essential to the explanation of the system of revelation. He has shown plainly enough his sense that man's original state is the necessary basis and type of all that follows in his religious history : yet he speaks of that original state as one of man's "proper being," with a destiny in which "*nature* was to find its crown and "justification." There is not a word of the supernatural character of that destiny—the direct beatific vision of God—nor of the supernatural endowments of body and soul, with which man was equipped for that destiny, and raised to the level of its sphere—the partaking of the Divine nature by sanctifying grace, freedom from concupiscence, and the gift of immortality. The whole passage conveys a picture of pure nature made perfect in its own degree. The doctrine is the doctrine of Pelagius revived in Hegel.

That we are not exaggerating, the writer's third principle will show : 3. "Our race was created for "conscious fellowship with God, for sonship, for the "life of spirit. And it is just in this department that "its failure has been most conspicuous. It is here "that the Divine Spirit has found His chiefest "disappointment. Everywhere He has found re-

"bellion—*not everywhere without exception*, 'for in "'every age entering into holy souls, He has made "'the sons of God and *prophets;*' but everywhere "*in such a general sense* that sin in fact and its "consequences covers the whole region of humanity." From a denial of the supernatural character of man's original state there must follow, as a necessary corollary, a denial of the existence and universality of original sin. This denial Mr. Gore, in the words just quoted, supplies. Moreover, the sin of humanity lies in the fact that "*men in great masses*" have not proved themselves worthy of their rational nature, but have suffered themselves to be "*dominated by the mere forces of nature.*"

4. The action of the Holy Spirit having thus been thwarted and spoiled, because mostly "*resisted, rejected, ignored, quenched,*" He secured for Himself a sphere of action amongst a remnant, that is, amongst the Jews, "until He should find in the "Son of Man, the Anointed One, the perfect realization of the destiny of man, the manhood in "which he can freely and fully work, etc." The question of the supernatural can now no longer be evaded. Mr. Gore, when face to face with the work of Christ, feels that a word must be said concerning what has hitherto been called supernatural religion. He says that word, and it is this: This work "is not natural, but supernatural—supernatural, that is, in view of the *false nature which* "*man has made for himself* by excluding God."

At last the truth is out plainly. Redemption is simply the reversal of the unnatural; regeneration is only the removal of a vicious accumulation that hid our native worth. Christ has set us in the supernatural order, not by raising us up above the level of our nature, but by raising our nature to the true level of itself. The whole essay is so hopelessly naturalistic and rationalistic that we cannot give it a Catholic meaning without sacrifice of consistency. As we read the writer's words we were perplexed by the introduction of such doctrines as the Divinity of Christ and the Atonement, Baptism and the Sacraments, The Trinity and Descent of the Holy Ghost; and we wondered what could be their relevancy. In fact, they have no place in the writer's system, nor are we sure that the writer has any real hold of these specific Christian dogmas. (See p. 336 and Note 2.) Yet the Essay has had no more serious charge brought against it than that it expresses a too liberal view of inspiration. Who would quarrel with Lessing or Hegel concerning his view of inspiration, and not rather contest the principles which are the support and warrant of that view? We are not wise in allowing the broad volume of waters to rush over our fruit-trees and flowers unstemmed, and in directing all our efforts to the paltry task of bursting a bubble floating on the surface. But this is really what has been attempted. And the bubble may burst, but the waters will continue to flow.

In past times, the Reformers strove to overturn the immortal, rock-built towers of the City of God by striking at them with 'The Book;' and now the Children of the Church stretch forth their hands to save 'The Book' from the assaults of the Children of the Reformers. "And thus the whirligig "of time brings in his revenges."

But, perhaps, some of the confusion that prevails may very justly be attributed to the loose and careless statements of writers on our own side; who have written with that easy familiarity of faith which can only be understood by those who never stop to weigh difficulties. Quite recently a writer in a leading Catholic paper (*Tablet*, March 7, 1891), writing under such circumstances that we had every reason to expect from him a clear, cautious, and accurate statement of the matter he had undertaken to explain, is yet found to be simply blundering into dangerous ambiguity. For, quite unmindful of the principles governing the application of Old Testament Scripture by the writers of the New Testament, and especially by S. Paul, oblivious of the spirit that reigned over the exegesis of the great Christian School of Alexandria, the writer just referred to lays down, broadly and without limitation, the following canon of Scriptural interpretation: "To place upon the words of Scripture a meaning which is not obvious and literal, is to play "with them, and this whether they refer to faith or "morals, or to anything else whatsoever." Did he

mean: To *deny* to Scripture its literal and obvious meaning is to play with it? Some such inversion is the only way of diminishing the eccentricity of his words. The present volume of DR. SCHANZ will, we trust, help to remove much of the obscurity that now overhangs many important questions.

The Translators wish to put on record their sense of indebtedness to the REV. J. MCINTYRE, D.D., for his assistance in the preparation of this volume.

ST. MARY'S, OSCOTT,
1st May, 1891.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE HISTORY OF RELIGION.

CHAPTER II.

THE INDO-GERMANIC RACE.

CHAPTER III.

THE HAMITES AND SEMITES.

CHAPTER IV.

UNCIVILIZED PEOPLES.

CHAPTER V.

THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL.

CHAPTER VI.

NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY.

CHAPTER IX.

REASON AND REVELATION.

CHAPTER X.

MIRACLES.

CHAPTER XI.

PROPHECY.

CHAPTER XII.

THE TRUSTWORTHINESS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

CHAPTER XIII.

INSPIRATION.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE INTERPRETATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

CHAPTER XV.

THE GOSPEL AND THE GOSPELS.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE LIFE OF JESUS.

CHAPTER XVII.

PERSON AND NATURE OF JESUS.

CHAPTER XVIII.

CHRIST'S DOCTRINE AND WORK.

CHAPTER XX.

A RETROSPECT.

CHAPTER I.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE HISTORY OF RELIGION.

Jews and Gentiles were wont to reproach Christians with seeking to introduce needless innovations in religion. The Jews were so convinced that their law, their religion, and their sanctuary were to abide for ever that, in spite of the warnings of the prophets, they expected from the Messias not reform in religion, but merely a restoration of their former prestige. From Jerusalem their renown would go forth to the whole world. Their Sabbaths and festivals, their rites and sacrifices, were to remain untouched, and to be solemnized with great pomp and magnificence in their new kingdom. Party politics kept alive the flame of hatred that the ruling class had enkindled against Jesus; but petty disputes about the absolute rest prescribed on the Sabbath set the whole country in a blaze. Even the Apostles found it difficult to disentangle themselves altogether from the external forms of Judaism. How tenaciously the Jewish Christians clung to the law and the ordinances of their forefathers! S. Paul was able to compile a catalogue of the hardships he had to endure at the hands of the Jews for transgressing the law. The Jews from Asia, when they saw him in the temple, stirred up all the multitude against him because he taught all men everywhere against the people. and the law, and this place.* In a work entitled the Acts of Peter and Paul,

* Acts xxi. 28.

belonging to the second century, Paul, on arriving in Rome, is made to pose before Jewish Christians as a genuine Israelite; "Defend the faith in which thou wast born and bred; for it ill "becometh thee, a Hebrew and coming of a Hebrew stock, to "call thyself a teacher of the Gentiles, and a patron of the "uncircumcised. Neither is it right that thou, being thyself "circumcised, shouldst make faith in circumcision void." And Paul perforce reassures his interloctures: "In this I am proved "to be a true Israelite that, as you yourselves see, I keep the "Sabbath, and observe circumcision in very deed. For on the "Sabbath God rested from all His works. Ours are the "Fathers, the Patriarchs, and the Law."[1]

In like manner the Gentiles, though without the same authority to fall back upon, resisted any attempt to introduce innovations in religion. They appealed to antiquity which, in their eyes, gave their religion the right to exist, and, what is more, stamped it with divine approval. Age imparts respectability. The further time recedes into the dark vista of the past, the nearer it approaches eternity; the more closely, too, mortal man is linked to the immortal gods. The Athenians, as the story goes, once asked the Delphic oracle which religion they were to embrace. "The religion of your forefathers," was the reply. But the Athenians were well aware that the religion of their forefathers had not been kept pure; otherwise the question was meaningless and unnecessary. So they asked a second time; "Our forefathers often changed their religion. "Which of them are we to follow?" And the oracle made answer: "The best." Cicero deems the oldest to be the best, because antiquity stands nearest to God.[2] Hence he regards the existence of a universal belief in a divine being as a proof that this belief has its root in man's nature. To him the faith inherited from his ancestors was a sacred thing.[3] Socrates,

1 Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden.* II. 1. Braunschweig 1887, p. 230.

2 Cicero, *De Leg* II. 16. See *Tusc.* I. 12. *A Christian Apology,* I. p. 292.

3 *Tusc.* I. 13. *De nat. Deor.* III. 2.

though compelled to drink hemlock for slighting the gods, still upheld the ancient religion. Plato ascribes his knowledge of God and the soul to the ancients, to the teaching of Egyptian priests, and the faith of the barbarians (Chaldees). In Aristotle's opinion, belief in the gods, as to its substance, has come down from the grey mist of antiquity; but the mythical embellishments are the work of later ages.[4]

To the charge of innovation the apologists made a twofold answer. Christianity, they said, is not absolutely new, but rather marks a forward movement in the direction of the old religion. Its foundations are laid in the Old Testament. Prophecy had prepared the way for its coming. How, then, can the Jews oppose that which does but fulfil Moses and the Prophets? With what face can the Gentiles stigmatize that as new, which is more ancient than the wisdom of their philosophers? The Prophets lived before Socrates and Plato; Moses is older than Homer. The apologists endeavoured to show not only in general that Eastern traditions, as both Plato and Herodotus admitted, were the well-head of Greek wisdom, but also to trace their philosophy to the Old Testament.

The apologists, however, are far from denying that Christianity is progressive. But why should progress be held up as a reproach? Did Greeks and Romans of the second and third centuries still believe the same as their fathers who lived a thousand, five hundred, or even two hundred years before? Is virtue to be measured merely by length of days? Is age the sole criterion of a good cause? Then it behooves us to go back to the first beginnings of the race, and revert to the primitive habits of eating acorns and dwelling in caves, of being clad in skins and offering up children in sacrifice.[5] Against this conclusion, reason, because it condemns errors and aberrations, rebels. Reason proves that Christianity has a right to exist, and shows its superiority to heathenism and Judaism. Christianity is as old as human reason.

4 Plato, *Tim.* 2. xxii. 48. *Phileb.* p. 16. Aristotle, *Metaph.* xxii. 8.

5 Prudentius, *Perist.* xi., 409. C. Symm. ii., 272. See Ambrose, *Ep.* 17. 18. 57.

The Fathers did not think that everything in heathenism is to be rejected as bad. For, besides bearing witness to the influence exercised by the Old Testament, to which allusion was made above, they further held that the *Logos* enlightens every man coming into this world. By the former tenet they give expression, unconsciously perhaps, to the conviction that the light of primitive revelation was never wholly extinguished. By the latter they confessed that divine providence had watched and guided the fallen human race. Reason and revelation joined hands, in paving the way for Christianity in the hearts of men. In accordance with this view Justin teaches that, even before Christ, all into whom the *Logos* entered, were Christians. Socrates and Heraclitus he mentions by name as Christians. Before Christ's coming, Clement of Alexandria insists, philosophy was necessary for the justification of the Greeks. It is still, he adds, useful unto piety, inasmuch as it is a preparation for those who acquire the faith by dint of argument. For God is the author of all good things, either immediately as in the case of the two Testaments, or only mediately as in the case of philosophy.[6] Origen, Clement's disciple, writes thus: "We are not to limit the words of "Christ to those which He has spoken with His own divine "lips, for He was the Word of God that spoke in Moses "and the prophets."[7] "What we now call the Christian "religion," says S. Augustine, "existed among the men "of old. During the whole interval that elapsed between "the beginning of the human race and the coming of "Christ in the flesh, it has never failed. When, however, "Christ came, the true religion, which already existed, "began to be called Christian."[8]

But while the Fathers proved the antiquity of Christianity from reason, and the action of the *Logos*, they still in-

6 Justin, *Apol.* ii., 8, 13; i. 46. Clement, *Strom.* i. 5, p. 331, 349, 356. See vi. 5. Kuhn, *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1841, p. 27. *Einleitung in die katholische Dogmatik.* 2nd edit. Tübingen, 1859, p. 350. Max Müller, *Essays*, 2nd edit. 1879, vol. i., viii. Bratke, *Die Stellung des Clemens Alex. zum antiken Mysterienwesen. Studien und Kritiken*, 1887, p. 647. Weiss, *Apologie des Christenthums*, 1878, i., p. 99.

7 *De Princ.* Preface, n. 1. See Kuhn, p. 367, 349.

8 *Retract.* i., 13, B.

sisted that a distinction great and wide, and not of degree only, obtains between heathen philosophy and Christian truth, and also between Judaism and Christianity. In heathenism, truth and error are blended, the truth being accessible only to a few. Judaism is but a shadow of the things to come. Still, it never occurred to the Fathers to regard revelation as a mere genetical development or evolution of the religious elements in the human mind, ripened by the circumstances of the age. Christian revelation, they held, had subdued the world, not because the sum total of religious knowledge had, as it were, found expression in one genius; nor because what, so to speak, was on the tip of every tongue had been uttered in clear and burning words by one master-mind; nor yet because the many rays that, in the days before Christ, streamed forth from the Logos, were united in Christ, the resplendent sun; but because, in their eyes, pre christian times were but a divine "paedagogia," preparing the hearts of men for the word that God was to reveal in Christianity. As Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and other heathen philosophers were firmly convinced that truth comes from God, and as, moreover, ancient peoples traced their religion to a divine revelation, so, in like manner, the Fathers bore witness to the universal belief in a primitive revelation, and to the persuasion that God had in divers ways been preparing mankind for the coming of Christ.

Modern history of religion is not yet within sight of definite and certain results. One point, however, it has brought out: the fundamental ideas of religion have, from the earliest times, been more or less the common property of all nations. Religious faith has ever found itself confronted with certain problems; and the answers, though various, have certain features in common. We may not assent to the view that the history of religion resembles the history of language, in offering nothing but new combinations of the same original elements. But there is hardly room to doubt that traces of a primitive revelation, defaced and disfigured though they be, by the

natural mind and corrupt will of man, are everywhere to be found. The heathen world is covered with fragments of truth, and footprints of God. Men's minds were never wholly free from misgivings or surmises as to an unseen world. At every turn we meet with ideas, sometimes obscurely expressed, that there is a higher order in the universe; we find all men wishing and hoping, however feebly, for better things, and longing to be united to God. The truths, that are divinely revealed in their fulness in Christianity, are contained, at least in shadow or in germ, in heathenism.[9] Nor were the Greek philosophers alone in giving a religious education to the human race. For, according to the Fathers, such enlightened men as Zoroaster, Buddha, and Confucius, the founders of religious communities among the Persians, Indians, and Chinese, consciously or unconsciously, had also their share in the great work of preparing the way for Christ. The goal for which they strove was that supreme divine truth and moral perfection which are manifested in Christ alone.

And, in truth, given a divine providence and the laws of historical development, what else should we have expected? Great events, as the saying goes, cast their shadows before. The laws of continuity and development hold no less in the life of men and in the world's history than in nature. And should not Christianity, the greatest event in the world's history, have been foreshadowed in the pre-christian development of mankind? For earlier observers, save only the chosen people, it was not easy to perceive the drift of events; it is far easier for one who takes his stand at the end and looks backward. Such an one is like unto a traveller who climbs up a high mountain with the twofold object of feasting his eyes on the beautiful panorama that lies before him, and of surveying the several stages of the road he has traversed, and who then combines the scattered features of the landscape in one complete and thrilling picture. Christianity ranges from end to end mightily,

9 Möhler, *Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze*. Edited by Döllinger. Regensburg, 1839, I., p. 225.

uniting past, present and future into an eternity. It views the earthly and the human in its causal relationship with the heavenly and the divine. It looks at time in the mirror of eternity, and views space with the eye of infinity. Christianity alone can trace the under-current of unity that percolates the Babel of History. It alone can show how what seems accidental and fortuitous, is really subservient to a higher purpose of divine providence, and how the true religion is indeed the touchstone of all religious development. As those only can appreciate the worth of Christianity who, in their life and creed, have tasted its blessings, so none but those who possess the true Christian religion can form a just estimate of the course of religious history, and thereby of the history of the world. In Christianity God Himself enters into the domain of history, and hence the history of man is made divine. In other words the whole economy of creation and redemption is represented as one act of divine providence. In this drama, to use the phrase of Clement of Alexandria, each soul has a definite and permanent part to play,[10] now and for all eternity.

Nowadays it is fashionable to assume that all things have been subjected to a process of gradual development by the agency of natural causes, and that the human race has been fashioned and educated by slow degrees. With many it is a foregone conclusion that Christianity, like other religions less fortunate, is merely the product of religious evolution in olden times. Christianity is, indeed, stamped with the unique personality of its founder ; but this potent fact is explained away as meaning nothing more than that Christ, being the greatest of religious heroes, was enabled, by his insight and penetration, to focus the rays refracted from earlier religions in one bright light, before which all others must grow pale. This view completely ignores the supernatural element that predominates in all religion, and in Christianity in particular ; still, on the other hand, some human influence on religion, and some kind of his-

10. Teichmüller, *Religionsphilosophie*, Breslau, 1886, p. 110. Haffner, *Grundlinien der Geschichte der Philosophie*, Mainz, 1881, p. 116.

torical development should not be simply put out of court. Even those who believe in revelation, and in Christianity as the supreme revelation, are constrained to allow in ancient religion a *præparatio evangelica*. In this, too, there is an analogy between creation and revelation, between nature and grace. As, in individuals, reason develops into self-consciousness only by degrees, so a lengthy gradual process had to be gone through before mankind could be disposed anew to receive the original grace and truth they had rejected. As it was God's will, not to set up the world all at once, nor to lead each individual man to Heaven otherwise than by the free use of his natural powers, so, in like manner, His divine revelation conforms itself to time and place. Thus the training of mankind had to proceed step by step. Christianity is not accessible to every stage of culture; it had to await the fulness of time when the nations had been duly prepared. The history of mankind, as it were, divides itself into two great streams: the Jewish and the heathen. The waters had to make their way through the soil and cut out their course, before they could unite and meet the great source whose waters flow into life eternal. Many Christian truths would have been unintelligible, had they been revealed to the mind before the heart had been set on fire with desire. As missionaries to the heathen make it their first business to arouse the necessary dispositions of heart and mind, so God adopted the same plan in instructing the human race.

History, it is said, is the best teacher. This saying is especially true in regard to the history of religion. A man will set greater store by his own religion[11] if he knows how far it agrees with and differs from other religions. Christianity has nothing to lose if traces of its truths are found imbedded in other religions. Assuredly its gain will be all the greater, if withal, it transpire, that no ancient religion approaches it within a measurable distance, in purity of doctrine and moral sublimity, and furthermore that the glory of all founders of religions pales before the light that

11 See Max Müller, *Essays*, Vol. I. p. 170. *Wissenschaft der Sprachlehre*, Vol. II. p. 394. Fischer, *Heidenthum und Offenbarung*, Mainz, 1878, Preface.

was manifested to the world in Christ. We may not ignore the history of religion, though in its latest phase it be drawn up in hostile array against the supernatural element in Christianity. Rather it should be the apologist's ambition to conquer a foe who will often supply weapons for an attack on the faith.

What position are we to assign to the history ot religion? There can be little or no doubt that, both in point of time and order, it should precede a treatise on the Christian religion. Both heathenism and Judaism are older than Christianity and have, each in its own way, made straight its paths. Christianity, though a divine act and a revelation from God, had its fulfilment at a definite time, and under definite historical circumstances. One might, perhaps, argue, with some plausibility, that non-christian religions should be studied after Christianity, on the ground that the true religion alone can furnish the correct standard for judging religions that are false or imperfect. The history and method of apology, however, demand the opposite order. As general apology sets out from general external and internal experiences, in order therewith to establish the truth that God may be known from nature, so, in like manner, it bases its exposition on the history of religion in order to raise thereon the specific truths of Christianity.

The old world may be divided into two groups, unequal but essentially distinct. In the eyes of a Greek none but Greeks were true men. All others ranked no higher than plants, cattle, and slaves; they were barbarians fit only for plunder. The Romans, the heirs of the Greeks, having extended their empire over the whole of the then known world, took a broader view. Though keenly conscious that a provincial was far below a Roman citizen, they gradually gave the conquered tribes a share in the administration of the empire, and admitted their gods into the Roman Pantheon. The Old Testament regards man from a religious standpoint. It also divides the human race into two classes: the worshippers of the true God,

Jahve, and idolaters. The chosen people, the descendants of Seth and Sem and Abraham, those consecrated to God by circumcision, were the privileged caste. Till Messianic times salvation was of the Jews alone. Only then were others admitted to a participation in this privilege; but the claim of priority was still assigned to the Jew. For the Messianic blessings were chiefly, and above all, for those who formed part of that Jewish kingdom, which, with Jerusalem and Sion as a centre, was to be exalted by the Messias into a world-wide empire. Hence the Jews were very severe in their judgments on the heathen.* That the heathen had been preparing for the Messias was a thought that had never crossed a Jew's mind. The Jews began to make proselytes only after the Babylonian captivity, at a time when historical circumstances particularly favoured this course.

The New Testament furnishes a clearer idea of the twofold preparation for the Redeemer that was going on among the Jews and the heathen. Jesus, indeed, appealed to the law and the prophets which He declared He had come to fulfil,† but He explained the law in spirit. He not only declared external ceremonial to be of secondary importance, but he also pointed to other sheep not of this fold;‡ He prayed for all men of all nations who should believe in Him.‖ Our Lord taught His disciples to pray to their Father in heaven Who maketh His sun to shine upon good and bad, and Who raineth upon the just and the unjust. S. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, has given a wonderfully vivid sketch of the world's history. In the centre stands Christ, the second Adam, the mediator betwixt heaven and earth, who has redeemed us from sin. In the background are Jews and Gentiles. The former had received God's revelation, but nevertheless they had erred and sinned. All their works were evil; all had swerved from the right path. Not even one was free from

* Wisdom xiii. 1.
† Matth. v. 17.
‡ John x. i.
‖ Ibid xvii. 1.

sin. There was no wise man that sought after God. On the other hand the Gentiles had not recognized God in His works, and when they knew, they did not glorify Him as God, but became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened. They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things. They hearkened not to the voice of conscience, but followed the lusts of the flesh. Wherefore God punished them with those things in which they had sinned, and gave them up to the desires of their heart, and to dishonourable passions.* Thus their religion ended in universal scepticism and immorality. The Law served to aggravate the sin of the Jews; the Gentiles, as they had sinned without the Law, were also judged without it. God concluded all under the law of sin, and involved all in disobedience, that He might have mercy on all.† Nevertheless the universal sin that God had permitted could not make void the eternal decree of salvation, but was rather to assist in its execution. The Jews were prepared for Christ by their law which revealed man's helplessness and made him yearn for a redeemer. Philosophy conducted the heathen to the same end. But philosophy was barren and empty, and revealed its own impotence.[12]

Nevertheless S. Paul finds that Jews and Gentiles had many points of connection with the glad tidings of the Gospel, which he was preaching. The Old Testament history discloses a progressive series of divine revelations and ordinances pointing to Christ; the natural knowledge of God can be revived, and conscience awakened from its slumbers. S. Paul has, indeed, dwelt chiefly on the negative aspect of ancient religions, but he is far from disparaging the positive element of preparation contained in them. To break with existing thoughts and habits was

* Rom. i.

† Ibid vi. 32.

12 See Mach, *Die Nothwendigkeit der Offenbarung Gottes, nachgewiesen aus Geschichte und Vernunft.*, Mainz, 1893, p. 48.

inevitable. It was, however, to be a breach that would restore man to his original destiny,—a destiny he had never wholly forgotten; that would quell the painful struggle raging within his soul; and build up religious and social life on a new foundation. But, owing to the limited historical knowledge of the time, S. Paul's thoughts did not range beyond the Roman Empire. He speaks only of Jews and Greeks who had hitherto been enemies one to another, but are now united in Christ, Who has broken down the wall of separation. Nor was it without God's permission that the majority of the Jews were excluded from the Messianic kingdom. Their place was taken by the Gentiles. And when the Gentiles have had their turn, a remnant of Israel shall be saved. When at Tarsus, S. Paul had an opportunity of making himself acquainted with the horrible rites of Phrygian worship. Later on, when at Ephesus and Corinth, he encountered in all its hideousness the sensual worship of the later Greeks, who had been debauched by Eastern influences. But his considerations rest, on the whole, upon the historical knowledge gained in the Roman Empire, and, in particular, at the great commercial centres. We have no means of knowing how far he had studied this religion in its history. Certainly he was not unfamiliar with the Greek poets; but their influence was effaced by the impression made on his earnest and divinely-enlightened mind, by the corrupt heathen life of the times.

The view of the Fathers was bounded practically by the same limited horizon. To them also the greater part of mankind was an unknown quantity. Christianity was, indeed, penetrating beyond the boundaries of the known world into Egypt and Persia. Eastern religious systems, however, were but imperfectly known. The Egyptian schools, with which the Alexandrians had made themselves acquainted, were degenerate and debased. It was not till the Crusades that Western nations were brought into contact with the peoples of the East. But the discoveries and researches of modern times have laid almost the whole

world at the feet of man. The sacred books of ancient religions have been rendered accessible; hieroglyphic and cuneiform inscriptions have been compelled to yield the hidden treasures of their wisdom; uncivilized tribes have been visited in their haunts and homes. Romans, Greeks, and Germans have hitherto been the scales in which heathenism has been weighed; but an earlier, higher and purer ideal, and deeper moral earnestness in Eastern religious systems, has now been brought to light. Views on savages have undergone a twofold modification. The ideal savage has vanished before the stern reality; the animal man has been better pictured in consequence of the study of religion. In this way we are able to gain some insight into non-christian religious development. Now that Creuzer's symbolical explanation of mythology has been universally abandoned, the students of the history of religion are hotly debating whether the philological school, represented by Kuhn and Max Müller, or the evolutionary school, to which most moderns belong, supplies the true explanation. It may, however, be regarded as certain that neither the mere influence of language on thought, nor the polytheism that springs from hero-worship or fetichism, can unlock the mysteries of religious development. The psychology of savages, and mere linguistic development, are equally incompetent to solve the problem. Without an all-ruling Providence, religious development is as unintelligible as this visible world without a purpose. The more knowledge advances, the more clearly is purpose discerned; so, in like manner, the greater our knowledge of the divers forms in which religion has manifested itself, the greater will be our grasp of the history of religion. In its brief, but brilliant, career, this new science has already demonstrated that the fundamental ideas of supernatural religion are common to all ancient religions and sagas; and thus it has been more clearly established that they, too, had their share in preparing the way for Christianity.

It is no business of ours, in this place, to set forth the history of religion in detail. But nowadays a short sketch is absolutely necessary, inasmuch as two important problems in apologetics are connected therewith: primitive revelation or primitive monotheism, and the origin of Christianity. The two subjects are, I say, closely connected. For if it be established that the debased heathen religions, in addition to error and vice, possessed many elements, distorted and misapprehended though they be, that betoken a primitive revelation and a clearer knowledge of God, then the appearance of Christianity on the scene cannot but prove attractive to the natural man. Christianity thereby loses, so to speak, somewhat of its startling and extraordinary character, in that it no longer shines forth in sharp antagonism to all existing sciences and creeds; but it gains in historical consecutiveness, and in the power to convince. Moreover, it gains in dignity and sublimity, for it is seen to be the goal to which all other religions were tending, the light that dispersed the darkness in which the most ancient religions were shrouded. The fact that for thousands of years Divine Providence had been directing religious life and thought to this end, does not weaken, but rather strengthens the divine character of Christianity; just as the universe, if said to be fashioned on one grand plan, causes the greatness of the Creator to stand out more transcendently than if he had, as it were, been obliged, after the manner of men, to come to its aid at every turn.

Of course the history of Israel is very different from this. For Israel, at the outset, lays claim not merely to a primitive but to a continuous revelation from God. Judaism comes in immediate contact with Christianity. For this reason it cannot form the beginning of our present treatise. But since Judaism culminated and continued in Talmudism, while Islam rested on the same principles and was propelled by a tendency, similar indeed, but not directed so exclusively against Christianity, it will be better to consider both these non-christian religions in

relation to Old Testament history.

The history of religion aims at reducing the several religions to a common denominator. Hence the history of heathen religions will naturally depend upon that science. But up to the present the received classifications are so diverse and contradictory, that one almost despairs at arriving at a division that shall be at once generally valid and truly genetic. The historical religions are always a strange compound, because in their career they have been subjected to the most varied influences. Sentiment, will, and judgment have, each in its own way, modified or distorted the common foundation of religion laid by tradition and the promptings of the human heart. Some seek to explain everything genetically, and set out from preconceived notions about origin and development, others deduce the manifold existing religions from *a priori* notions. Undoubtedly religion and the human soul are in nature most intimately connected. But the soul is neither merely the principle of cognition of religion, nor should it be taken for granted that it is the main source whence religion flows. We must not make light of the influence exerted by the will on religious life and thought. So far the nature of the soul has failed to explain the nature of religion. Precedence should therefore be given to historical facts.

One chief classification divides religion into savage and civilized, or natural and cultured. It is difficult, however, for this division to hold its ground. For it cannot be wholly denied that peoples who are now savages, formerly stood on a higher level of civilization. The idea of the "natural man" as conceived last century, like the idea of "natural religion" is a pure abstraction which, so far, no one has succeeded in verifying. Writing, however, may be taken as a safe test of this distinction. Accordingly we may distinguish written and unwritten,[13] natural and historical religions.[14] This coincides very nearly, though

13 Max Müller, *Einleitung in die vergleichende Religionswissenschaft*, 1874. p. 115.
14 Drey. *Apologetik*, II. 68.

not quite, with the distinction into popular and personal religions. Writing has been the chief agent in spreading civilization. Only the nations that have a refined literature rank as civilized. Indians, Parsees, Jews, Christians and Mohammedans are all civilized, and their religions are based on Canonical Scriptures. Some religions have sacred books: Brahmanism, Buddhism, Zoroasterism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, with their offshoots; and their sacred books are respectively: Vedas, Tripitaka, Zend-Avesta, the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Koran.[15] The classification into written, and unwritten or natural religions has therefore some external justification. It, however, sets out with the assumption that these religions were reared on these books as on a foundation. Now it can be shown that an oral tradition, of a longer or shorter duration, had in each case preceded the composition of the books. Religions are not founded on books; but books are a more or less perfect reflection and vehicle of religious tradition. Religion is older than writing; but writing is an excellent test of religious development. For, besides bearing witness to doctrines and precepts, persons and events, written documents render great service to the comparative science of religion by affording a glimpse into spiritual motives, and into the relations that subsist between religion and language. This is the great merit of the philological school. It is vain for the Folklorists to gainsay the results that the philological school have obtained in regard to the Indo-Germanic family.

Moreover, the written religions are made up, in great part, of natural elements. This fact alone, apart from any question as to origin, shows that natural and written religions are of the same kith and kin. The previous development and subsequent history of these book-religions do not by any means appear to have been always in a progressive and ascending line. Anyhow it cannot, without proof, be assumed as impossible that natural religion should have some features in common with civilized

15 Max Müller, l.c. p. 96.

religion in its earlier stages. In point of fact a non-christian religion belongs definitely to some one people, race, or country. Its characteristics are determined either by the person of the founder, or by the country, nationality, or history of the people. But the particular presupposes the general. Ideas and customs in the concrete must be referred to general religious ideas and inspirations nestling in the soul.

Religions are also divided into world-wide or universal, and provincial or particular.[16] But this division is too narrow, to embrace within its folds national and racial religions. Then, again, universality may either mean an attribute, or merely state a fact. All religions before Christ, Buddhism perhaps excepted, would, in their actual inception, have to be set down as particular. Christianity alone is universal in every sense.

A further classification into revealed and unrevealed religions (if, indeed, this be not identical with the division into civilized and natural) is also inadequate. For their characteristics, howsoever much forgotten or misunderstood, are drawn from a primitive revelation. Nearly all religions make pretensions to a revelation ; the rest are and must be a cross between natural and revealed.

Again, religions are classified by Réville, Fritz, and others as monotheistic and polytheistic. This classification labours under a similar defect. It really begins with later forms, and assumes, tacitly or expressly, that religion generally, or at least most religious systems began in polytheism. With equal right, to say the least, we may begin at the other end, and make monotheism the well-head of religious development. Civilized religions furnish many indications that the polytheistic system is of later growth. In natural religion this is not always so palpably clear. Still its followers believe in some sort of Supreme Being. Mythology, which is in itself an inextricable labyrinth,

16 Drey, *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1827, p. 234, seq., 591, seq., Folkmar, *Jesus Nazarenus, und die erste christliche Zeit.* Zürich, 1882, p. 3. Kuenen, *Folksreligion und Weltreligion*, Berlin, 1883, p. 4. Chanterie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, Freiburg, 1887, vol. p. 38.

ceased in later times to be regarded as sagas of the gods, and subsided into fable. This fact goes far to show that mythology, as a divine saga, was a corruption of the belief in one God. An original monotheistic worship of heaven is to be found among all peoples."[17] Scientists do not now look on this question with a favourable eye. Even Max Müller calls it a legacy from the Middle Ages.[18] Every religion claims a primitive revelation. Others assume polytheism in the form of deified nature, or deny that a reflective monotheism existed in primitive times.[19] It may be granted that the features and lineaments of heathen religions are pantheistic; still it by no means follows that pantheism is the original religion. Rather it is the outcome of development and long reflection. The religious idea, which in the beginning was one, was gradually split asunder into its various component elements; but the mutual relation in which these stand to each other was no longer understood. Then reflection came to the rescue, and strove to restore the sense of unity. But, owing to the preponderating influence of a naturalistic tendency, this unity could not but assume a pantheistic shape. Polytheism had its beginning in that worship of nature and its forces which, under one form or another, is common to most ancient religions; thus it is branded as a decline and fall from a higher knowledge of God.

The source of religion can hardly be sought in the *ego*. Nor can belief in one God, or in the unity of the world, have originated in the unity of self-consciousness being transferred to the visible world.[20] But the unity of the human consciousness assuredly proves that monotheism is more in accord with man's heart and mind than polytheism. In what other way could self-conscious man regard

17 Gloatz, *Speculative Theologie in Verbindung mit der Religionsgeschichte.* Gotha, 1883, Vol. i., pp. 122, 130, 278.

18 *Ursprung und Entwicklung der Religion.* Strassburg, 1881, p. 291.

19 Asmus, *Die indogermanische Religion in den Hauptpunkten ihrer Entwicklung* Halle, 1875, 1877, Vol. II. p. 30.

20 Fritz, *Aus antiker Weltanschauung. Die Entwicklung des jüdischen und griechischen Volkes zum Monotheismus nach den neuesten Forschungen.* Hagan, 1886, p. 202.

the universe than as an organism destined to subserve an intelligent purpose? If, however, as Schelling contends, polytheism marks an advance on monotheism, the *ego* or self-consciousness cannot be the beginning of development. The *ego* is not man's first conscious idea. The child only attains self-consciousness by means of the *non-ego*. It is the same with the life of peoples and of mankind as with individuals. But since no equivalent self-conscious *non-ego* existed in the beginning, monotheism, in its commencement, could only be referred to divine influence, or to a primitive revelation. The science of religion cannot marshal any positive arguments to do battle with this conclusion. The appeal that most religions make to a primitive revelation is a very strong point in favour of this conclusion; unless we are prepared to attach no weight to the universal religious sense and tradition of mankind regarding the fundamental facts of religion. It may be urged, perhaps, that the difficulty can be solved by an appeal to the mere general or collective development, which as yet includes no individual self-consciousness, but only supposes some higher forms or states of psychical life known as enthusiasm or ecstasy.[21] But this, again, is impossible. For how can there be a general or collective development aiming at personality, when the goal has not been fixed by a personality? Collectiveness supposes individuality. We may, indeed, thus account for the appearance of some particular personalities and masters in philosophical and religious thought, such as Socrates and Zoroaster, Moses and Jeremias; but the entire expanse of human development cannot be thus explained. Nay, even in the case of these eminent personages, it should not be forgotten that a higher element has been at work.

Polytheism marks a decline from a higher state, as is plain from the fact that it ever rushes in a downward course. Anthropomorphism, idolatry, and the worship of the stars, animals, and nature, are the sloughs into which it ever plunges. Again, it brands itself as a decline, inas-

21 Fritz, p. 230.

much as moral corruption is not only its inseparable ally in point of fact, but the two stand to each other in relation of cause and effect. Time may have lopped off many revolting excrescences; but the whole tree is eaten up with rottenness. The only cure for moral evil is to pull up the tree, root and branch. No calculations on error and religious decadence can dispense with "good free-will." To make the mind and metaphysics the sole basis of classification is labour lost;[22] for the will is a power both in religion and cognition. False ideas and false principles, defective apprehension of facts, false combinations of facts and ideas, are some of the causes of error; but error often precedes reflection, and is often due to moral obliquity. Knowledge alone does not make up religion; it must be associated with sentiment. Every form of religion is characterized by certain well defined acts. But if this be so, then no *a priori* principles of division will suffice for a religion that includes the ideas of fear, sin, and righteousness. The scheme lacks historic reality. History confronts us with many different forms and blends of religion, which register a moral standard as well as a standard of culture. If to the idea of fear are joined those of righteousness and sin, polytheism will necessarily lead to monotheism, because righteousness and the commandments can come from none but a personal God. Thus the influence of the moral sense is established.[23] Why should it be deemed impossible that a decline from righteousness should lead to polytheism, the religion of fear, when atheism must needs be the transition from one to the other?

These groups, which have been constructed *a priori*, exist side by side, and cross and re-cross one into the other. In like manner, there are some religious systems that will not fit either into the monotheistic or the polytheistic scheme of division. The dualistic, henotheistic, and atheistic systems would all have to be fitted in.[24] Some authors

22 Teichmüller, l.c. pp. 10, 99.
23 Ibid., p. 99, 285, 295.
24 Max Müller, *Religionswissenschaft*, p. 126.

have even attempted the task.[25] Since, however, all religions before Christ, whether natural or historical, are set down as polytheistic, this classification has no greater value than that which divides religions into natural and historical. The same may be said of the division founded on the genesis of language, provided the Jewish be regarded as specifically distinct from the other Semitic religions. The heads of this classification are: Turanian, Semitic, Aryan; dualistic; God in history; God in nature.[26] With this in the main agrees the division based on the genesis of the speculative philosophy of religion.[27] Its distribution is as follows: Beginnings of religion; the Indo-Germanic nations (Indians, Persians, Germans, Greeks, and Romans); Semites; Christians.

A correct appreciation of the kind and quality of religion is of as much importance in apologetics, as problematical speculations on its genesis and development. For this purpose the moral tendency has to be observed as much as the intellectual. Nay more, it may be said that the moral aspect is of greater consequence, because the commanding position occupied by religion in history is due primarily to its moral influence on the life of nations. For this reason it has been suggested that religions should be classified as natural and moral; and the suggestion has recently been favourably received. Hegelian philosophers like Asmus, Scharling and von Hartmann distinguish spiritual religion from religion determined by nature: Naturalism, Spiritualism, Theism. This distinction chiefly regards the moral side of religion. Religions were classified by Tiele as natural and moral, according as the gods were conceived as natural objects or moral beings. Again natural religions are divided into three groups:

1—Religions in which magic and animism hold sway, and which are characterized by devil-worship. These are the religions of savages.

25 Volkmar l.c., p. 2.
26 Max Müller, l.c., p. 139 seq.
27 Pfleiderer, Berlin, 1884. See Teichmüller, p. 97, a. 1, 101.

2—Refined or organized magical religions. These may be described as semi-animal and semi-human (therianthropical) polytheism. In this category are included the Japanese, Dravidian, Finns, Esths, the half-civilized tribes of America, Arabians, Pelasgi, Italians, Etruscans, Sclavs, ancient Chaldeans and Egyptians, and the old empire of China.

3—The worship of God in human form, of semi-ethical beings, but of super-human strength. This is anthropomorphic polytheism. This class embraces the Vedic Hindus, ancient Persians, later Babylonians and Assyrians, civilized Semitic tribes, Celts, Germans, Hellenes, Greeks and Romans.

Moral religions fall into two classes:

1—National nomistic religious communities. Under this heading come Taoism, Confucianism, Brahmanism, Jainism, primitive Buddhism, Mazdeism, the Mosaic religion and Judaism.

2—Universal religious communities. This division would embrace Islam, Buddhism and Christianity.

Here, it is clear, only formal moral precepts serve as a distinguishing mark. For, as a matter of fact, all religions lay either customary or special moral obligations on their disciples. May be to one the idea of the infinite is brought home by nature, to another by conscience. Hence a great distinction may be made between the Indo-Germanic, Semitic and Turanian religions.[28] In no case, however, can the moral element be excluded. In the case of the Hindus, Varuna alone, whom the ancient Vedas represent as king of gods and men, and as the all-seeing, all-judging, all-avenging ruler of the world, would suffice to prove that a moral element was essential to the beginning of religion. In its later development it was strangled by a demon and nature worship; but this fact, far from disproving, actually goes to show that God had decreed and established a moral religious order from the beginning. Moral mono-

28 Max Müller, *Ursprung*, p. 242 seq. See Vetter, *Die neuere Mythenforschung auf vedischem Gebiete. Literarisch. Rundschau*, 1883, Nos. 1 and 9.

theism or Theism existed only, strictly speaking, among the Jews. Among other civilized peoples the moral law suffered under the influence of the later polytheism or naturalism, and yet among some peoples, as, for instance, Hindus, Greeks, Romans and Egyptians, it retained considerable importance. The same may be said of the dualistic systems. Hand in hand with what may be called the cosmological dualism goes an anthropological ethical one; and there can be no doubt that priority or superiority was ascribed, at least in the beginning, to the good principle, God.[29]

As the prima-facie probability favours the supposition that the history of religion presents us with a retrograde movement, it will be better to keep to the distinction between civilized and natural religions. To the most ancient civilized religions belong the religions before Christ that possess canonical Scriptures, that is the religions of the Aryan family. We have thought it a simpler and easier plan to treat of the different periods of the several religions immediately after one another, and to bring all the Indo-Germanic branches together. The Semites, the Jews excepted, will fitly follow. Egyptians form the connecting link; savages the continuation.

This would seem the proper place to give a survey of the number of those professing the different religions. Estimates, indeed, vary considerably. Generally the total number of human beings is set down at about 1435 millions. Of these, according to the *Planisphærium* published by the Lyons Propaganda, 419,710,000 fall to the share of Christian denominations: (Catholics 212,100,000; Schismatics 83,810,000; Non-Catholics 123,800,000); Israelites 6,890,000; Mohammedans 200,000,000; Brahmanists 163,000,000; Buddhists 7,000,000; Chinese 300,000,000; Japanese 35,900,000; other heathens 228,500,000.[30] Hübner counts 432,000,000 Christians or 30.2% (Catholics 218,000,000;

29 Teichmüller, p. 285 seq.

30 See Fischer, *De salute infidelium*. Essendiæ, 1886, p. 2, seq. *Missions Catholiques*, Lyon, 1883, p. 273, seq. Hübner, *Geographisch-statische Tabellen aller Länder der Erde*, 1884. Saussaye, p. 41.

Non-Catholics 123,000,000; Greeks 83,000,000; others 8,000,000); Mohammedans 120,000,000 or 8.3%; Israelites 8,000,000 or 5%; 503,000,000 Buddhists or 35%; 130,000,000 Brahmanists or 9.6%; 234,000,000 fetish-worshippers or 16.4%.

CHAPTER II.

THE INDO-GERMANIC RACE

§1. The Hindus.

In our sketch we shall begin with the civilized races. And first we shall treat of the Indo-Germanic or Aryan races. At the summit stand the Hindus, whose religion, at once the oldest and most advanced, is a rich mine that cannot fail to yield abundant treasure to religious historians and philologists exploring its caverns and recesses. Its beginning and origin are lost in the twilight of fable, and yet, in spite of numerous vicissitudes, its essential character has remained unchanged. That essential character may be said to consist in mysticism and antagonism to the real world. The Indian religion is enshrined in a comprehensive literature, whose beginning stretches as far back, perhaps, as the year 2,000, and whose end has only been reached at a relatively late epoch. For long ages it was propagated by word of mouth; but, in default of historical information, its place in history cannot be more than approximately determined. Tradition was regarded as a cosmic principle, a divine, almighty, and eternal force; and it has always maintained its position in literature.

The most ancient MSS. go no further back than the 9th or 10th century A.D. The oldest portion of their sacred books, which are known as the *Vedas* (*οἶδα*, to know,

knowledge),[1] is the *Rig-Veda*. It consists of hymns of praise, arranged according to the families of bards, and offers many points of resemblance with the Psalms. But, as the several parts are of very different ages, it is hardly possible to arrange the hymns in chronological order. Attempts have recently been made to dislodge the Rig-Veda from the pre-eminent position hitherto accorded to it, and to put its contents on a level with those of the other Vedas, even the *Atharva-Veda*. The Rig-Veda should no longer be regarded as a sort of encyclopædia of all the more ancient ideas held by the Indo-Germanic race, but only as a collection of the notions prevalent in a very circumscribed area. We may, however, in general distinguish three periods: The *Early Veda* or *Varuna* period; the *Middle Veda* or *Indra* period; and the *Later Veda* or *Brahman* period.[2]

The other Vedas, the *Sama-Veda*, *Yajur-Veda*, and *Atharva-Veda* are made up partly of hymns, borrowed from the *Rig-Veda*, and arranged for liturgical purposes, and partly of ordinances, sacrificial formulæ, incantations and adjurations. The Sama-Veda contains the hymns used in the Soma sacrifice, the Yajur-Veda the ceremonial prescribed in the sacrifices. The Atharva-Veda, apart from the hymns taken from the Rig-Veda, is for the most part a collection of incantations and benedictions, without systematic arrangement. It is the most recent of the four Vedas, and probably belongs to the 11th century. The Veda certainly existed in its entirety before the days of Buddha.

In each of the Vedas, the hymns (*Mantras*) must be carefully distinguished from the later prose works, the casuistic expositions of the hymns, and the sacrificial ritual (*Brahmanas*). Moreover there are the *Sutras* which, being as it were limbs of the Veda (*Vedanga*), rank with the Veda proper. The questions discussed in the *Sutras* are various,

1 See Max Müller, *Essays*, i., 1 seq. *Kirchenlexicon*, 2nd edit., ii. p. 1180 seq. Fischer, *Heidenthum und Offenbarung*., Mainz 1878, p. 13 seq.

2 See Vetter, *Liter. Rundschau*, 1883, p. 264. Chr. Pesch, *Der Gottesbegriff in den heidnischen Religionen des Alterthums*, Freiburg, 1885, p. 5 seq. Flöckner, *Theol. Quartalschr*. 1887, p. 47 seq.

some concerning ceremonial, morality and justice, others on grammar and metre. The first two are called *Sruti* (hearing, sacred doctrine), and the third *Smriti* (memory, tradition).

From this we may see how extremely difficult it is to divide the Hindu religion into periods. Internal grounds are almost our only guide. For, as the Hindus were deficient in the historic sense, no great reliance can be placed on their history, as handed down by them. At one time Max Müller's classification found great favour with scholars. He distinguished four periods in the development of Hindu literature:

(1) The *Tshandas* period, in which the hvmns were composed (1800—1400 B.C.).

(2) The *Mantra* period, during which a collection of the hymns was made (1400—1000 B.C.).

(3) The *Brahmana* period (1000—600 B.C.).

(4) The *Sutra* period (600—200 B.C.).

Now, however, that the later literature receives some of the attention of which the Vedas formerly enjoyed a monopoly, scholars have adopted Barth's classification into five periods: Vedism, elder Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism, and younger Brahmanism or Hinduism.[3]

The beginning of Hindu development goes back to prehistoric times. On this question, as on every other, the philological and anthropological schools hold diametrically opposite opinions, and, what is more remarkable, philologists are at loggerheads with one another. In laying stress on the popular element in song and saga, manners and customs, the Folklorists and Tylor's anthropological school are certainly in the right,[4] but, as the Hindu religion is historical, we must above all be guided by documentary evidence. The Vedas, as we now have them, give a very clear picture of the formation of myths. It is, therefore, a strong temptation to suppose that the religion

3 See Wurm, *Geschichte der jüdischen Religion im Umriss dargestellt*. Basle, 1874. *Liter. Rundschau*, 1883, p. 230. Fischer, p. 20. *Revue de l'histoire des religions.* Paris, 1880, vol. i., p. 23.

4 Gardoz, A. Lang.

of the Indo-Germanic races began with nature-myths, from which Henotheism, Polytheism, Monotheism and Pantheism were gradually evolved. Or, at least, it would seem to suggest that the nature myth is the shell in which the religious idea was in the earliest times encased. Then, as the result of a long and tedious process,[4] the shell was cast off, and an objectively theistic and spiritual religion crawled forth. The idea of the Infinite arose and was matured partly by "palpable" objects, such as stones and shells, partly by "semi-palpable" (trees and so forth) and partly by "impalpable" objects, for instance heaven, the sun, stars and dawn. We may call this the solar interpretation, according to the sun-myth of M. Müller. Kuhn, Lauer and Asmus have propounded a meteorological hypothesis, according to which natural phenomena (storms &c.) were the occasion of man acquiring an idea of the Absolute and Infinite. The supreme God battles with the dæmons, in order to obtain the mastery over the rain. The essence of the several inferior gods depends on the part they play in the myth. For in Henotheism, or the initial stage of development, the gods have as yet no strongly marked individuality, nor is the line between the divine and the earthly sharply drawn. From this were evolved the ulterior forms of the religion of the Indo-Germanic tribes, in particular the acosmic Pantheism of India.

Thus far one fact only is beyond cavil: that, before the Indo-Germanic family dispersed, their religion had reached the stage of nature-worship. But we hold it to be established by empirical researches[5] that their religion, in the earliest period of their history, was monotheistic and spiritual. Traces of this earlier spiritual religion may be clearly discerned in the older Vedas. Whether, as was formerly contended, the religious ideas enshrined in the

4 See Max Müller, *Vorlesungen über den Ursprung*, &c. Asmus, *Die indogermanische Religion*, Vol. I., p. 143. *Liter. Rundschau*, l.c. Chanterie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*. Freiburg, 1887, Vol. I., p. 143. *Revue de l'histoire des rel.*, 1880, p. 242, seq.

5 Schoebel, *Recherches sur la religion première de la race Indo-Iranienne*, Paris, 1872. Vetter, *Liter. Rundschau*, 1883, p. 263.

hymns are merely considered as the naive expression of early religious poetry, or whether, on the contrary, as some have recently sought to prove,[6] they already bear the marks of highly advanced priest-craft, and of a reaction against mythical and magical ideas in religion : in any case, how great soever be the stress laid on the "naturalistic origin of myths," this ancient "masonic jargon," intelligible to none but the initiated, is deeply saturated with religious ideas about the universe. If, as critical history must allow, the Vedic religion oscillates between two extremes—pure and simple pantheism and a species of monotheism with divers titles[7]—then it is admitted to have at least some monotheistic feature. In consequence of the close connection subsisting between the deity and natural forces, belief in the unity of the world, that is, the pantheistic identification of the infinite with the finite, was ever striking deeper root.

The most ancient gods of the Indo-Germanic race went by the generic name of "Deva,"—a word used of the sun and heaven, of the dawn and the storm, and meaning usually that which is luminous, bright, brilliant.[8] "Deva" is also the Indo-Germanic symbol of heaven. Thus Dyupater means heavenly father, of which the Latin *sub divo* seems to be an echo. The word δῖος is of narrower import, and only by doing violence to the word can θεός be traced to a similar origin. Perhaps *deva* was used as the name of God, because of the meaning it bore. It is not, however, the sole Indo-Germanic name for this deity. Thus it would be equivalent to the Semitic *El*, *Ilu*, *Elohim*, to the Greek *Zeus*, and the Latin *Jupiter*. The same word reappears in *Ziu* and other Aryan names applied to the highest God, and it proves that these religions were originally akin, and that they had a monotheistic origin. So Max Müller can retort on those who deprecate the application of linguistic studies to mythology, by boasting that the

6 Bergaigne. See *Revue de l'hist. des rel.*, l.c., p. 545. Saussaye, p. 353, 358.
7 Barth, *Revue*, p. 262.
8 Max Müller, *Essays*, Vol. I., p. 23.

greatest historical discovery of the nineteenth century is entombed in the formula: *Dyaus-Pitar* = *Zeus Pater* = *Jupiter* = *Tyr*. "The Gods of the Aryans are not an "organized republic, but have a king. Over the gods "is a supreme God Zeus, Jupiter, Varuna, Ahura-"Mazda."[9]

Interpreted literally, the religion set forth in the Vedas is Polytheism. Hindu poets had not the strict and definite notions and ideas which we should require for distinguishing one from the other. In their eyes every God is the divinity. *Deus* (from *Deva*) enables us to see in the dim distance, far beyond the Vedas, the original source from which Romans and Hindus drew the name of their god, and the elements of their religion and language. The root *dyu* is found only in Sanscrit as the name for God. All the Indo-Germanic languages have this word, and no other, for God. Even if it be granted that *Dyaus* (heaven) or *Dyaus Pitar* (heavenly father) means no more than deified natural forces, still, the very application of a singular name to these symbols would prove our point. The one purely theistic concept of God, which is certainly expressed in Dyaus, Varuna, Indra, must have preceded; thus it alone can account for the origin of the names.

In the earliest times the Devas were addressed in the plural, though perfectly equal one to another. They were honoured as holy beings, and as thirsting for holiness. By and bye they appear invested with various other names, according as they represent the forces of nature, or different manifestations of the one supreme and infinite being, or his relations to the world. In this capacity they are designated *Aditijas*, the Eternals. *Aditi*, the Infinite, Infinity, Boundlessness, Eternity, is their mother. In the Rig-Veda Aditi is subordinate to Varuna and Indra, and disappears entirely in the Zend-Avesta. Most scientists represent Aditi as mother of the Aditijas, in a naturalistic

9 *Revue*, 1880 (I.), p. 305, 394. 1886 (xiv.), p. 108. Max Müller, *Nineteenth Century*, October, 1885. Saussaye, p. 151.

fashion. Taking the word Aditi as signifying the untied, the imperishable, they referred it to the imperishable day-light,[10] or the sea of light whence the dawn arose,[11] to the visible infinite, to heaven and earth. In the first case it would be an abstraction of late origin, in the second "one of the oldest ideas and creations of Indian fancy." But the very antithesis shows that an older concept must have lain at bottom. The worship of Aditi discloses the remnant of a primitive spiritual religion, disfigured by naturalistic excrescences. The natural man inherited a brighter age, the floating idea of a being infinite in time and space, and his sensuous soul, longing to give concrete expression to its confused idea, found the most suitable image in the ever-returning dawn.[12] In the Vedas Aditi is conceived as the Eternal, but not personified. The current of opinion, however, is slightly indicated, and later times, without further ado, assumed a goddess Aditi, with six sons Aditijas.[13] By comparing the Aditijas with the Ameschaspentas in the Zend-Avesta, we are led to conjecture that they were a species of genii who, as pure spirits and beings of light, stand, like the angels, in attendance on the supreme God. Still we must remember that Varuna and Mitra are included in this cycle. Six, though the regular is not the only number for the cycle of the Aditijas.

If *Deva*, the luminous, the shining, whose symbol is the sunlight, was really the supreme God of light, he could easily appear in the day-time as Mitra (god of daylight), and in the night as Varuna (Uranos, god of starlight). Since Mitra is never mentioned without Varuna, but Varuna often occurs without Mitra, Mitra is included in Varuna. The hymns bestow higher epithets on Varuna than on all the other gods. He is not a god in the sense of an element of heaven, but as the spiritualized form of Dyaus. Onto-

10 Max Müller, Essays, Vol. I., p. 26. Against: Saussaye, p. 227 seq. Hillebrant. *Ueber die Göttin Aditi*, Breslau, 1876. See *Liter. Rundschau*, 1883, p. 228, *Revue de l'hist. des rel.* l.c., p. 244.

11 Max Müller, *Ursprung.* See *Rundschau*, p. 260. Fischer, p. 26.

12 Vetter, *Rundschau*, Sp. 229.

13 Roth, *Zeitschrift der morgenl. Ges.* Vol. vi., p. 68.

logically, physically, and ethically, he is the sole and supreme God of ancient India, the Indian *Asura* (spirit), the great *Asura*,[14] the Lord—a word subsequently applied to demoniacal powers. According to etymology, Varuna signifies the " ruler," the " governor." He is the king of gods and men, the creator and sovereign lord of the world, who can do all things, who sees, judges and avenges all. To him man humbly confesses his sin. The sinner dreads his punishment, and hopefully implores his grace and protection. He is the god of order, of the rule (*Rita*) on which heaven is modelled. In his dealings with mankind Mitra (like the Persian *Mithra*, described by Plutarch as *μεσίτης*[15]) ever stands at his side, as the mediator betwixt god and man. Thus both dualism and pantheism are eschewed. Varuna created heaven and earth, though, indeed, he is in a certain sense identified with the whole universe. The Rig-Vedas account for the uniform regularity of the heavens by saying " All is in Varuna, or by Varuna." But this expression or explanation implies more than a mere unconscious pantheism. The foundations of Theism lie in the very heart of man. With all the more reason are we bound to look upon its most ancient expression as the real and genuine representation of religious belief.

Religious worship, in those patriarchal times, was still very simple. Traces of sacerdotalism, however, are distinctly discernible in the old hymns. It seems to have been a regular institution among the Indo-Germanic tribes in ancient times. The union of the priesthood with the highest offices in the state and at court was a work of time. Their essential duty was prayer. Later on it was also their business to chant during the sacrifices. The sacrifices, which were an important part of worship, consisted probably of animals or food. Bloody sacrifices were subsequently wholly discontinued. Sanctification and the

14 Fischer, p. 22 seq., p. 36 seq. Vetter, p. 262. Pesch, p. 6 seq. Schrader, *Sprachvergleichung*, p. 432. Saussaye, p. 354.

15 *De Is. et Osir c.* 46.

remission or sin were their object. For, in the Vedic religion, the consciousness of guilt is as prominent as the belief that the gods can remove from men the heavy load of sin. It was in the nature of this religion that personal guilt should have been often overlooked in presence of the sin of the whole race, and that forgiveness of sin should have been regarded as an act of clemency and indulgence on the part of the gods. Still the moral element is not altogether drowned in the external faults and sins of ritual; very often it stands out in bold relief. Men began to strive more and more for earthly happiness. The worship of *Agni* and *Soma*, by efficaciously blending word and form with the elements, afforded a mysterious means of grace. For the narcotic libation made from the juice of the Soma (*asclepias acida*) was intended to restore to man immortality, and to compensate him for the enjoyment of the tree of life, of which the fall had deprived him. The Rig-Veda says nothing about the transmigration of souls, but it contains many allusions to the immortality of the soul and eternal life. Reference is even made to the resurrection of the body.[16] Morality was in close connection with religion. Apart from the external worship of God in prayer and sacrifice, a special value is attached to the inward intention. Untruthfulness, hypocrisy and faithlessness are reprobated.

The *Indra* period, in which the Vedas were collected into a volume (hence called *Sanhita* or collection) and enriched with some new hymns, is conservative in character. It is progessive, however, in so far as Indra, the God of rain, whose name seldom occurs in the oldest hymns of the Rig-Veda, now steps forth as the one God of heaven, and represents the good elements. Varuna now appears as the god of the sea and the water, while his son Vak or Vaku (Wind) created all things. About the year 1400, Varuna is all but dethroned, and Agni, till now inferior to Mitra, takes Mitra's place. *Agni* (*ignis*), in his capacity of fire-god, is the messenger of heaven. He comes

16 *Revue*, p. 248. Fischer p. 84 seq.

down from above, and bears gifts and sacrifices to heaven; but he did not assume a human form (Incarnation!). Through sacrifice he bestows heavenly goods. He is also the life-giver, having in himself the germs of life. The rays of dawn are metamorphosed into the brothers of *Uschas* (Dawn),—two beautiful youths *Asrinas* (swift horsemen) like the Dioscuroi. The luminous clouds, the rising sun (*Surja*), the sinking sun (*Savitar*), the setting sun (*Puschan*), were all deified. Thus was formed a complete cycle of gods, revolving round light as their centre; or rather they were the names (*nomina* not *numina*) for the different manifestations of the one God of light.[17]

Perhaps the reason of this metamorphosis is to be found in the wars with the aboriginal Dravidians, still very numerous in the south, and with the Aryan inhabitants of the land of the five streams, whither the Aryans from the Upper Ama Darja had emigrated. Varuna and Mitra, the gods of truth and justice, were forced to yield to a warlike god, representing brute force, and undaunted courage. Even in this nature-worship one supreme god still stands at the head; and thus the salient characteristic of monotheism is so far preserved. Nevertheless the worship of Indra, as compared with that of Varuna, marks a decline; for Indra became a mere national god, and a god of war, who, as such, had dominion over all the other gods. In the earliest days of the Aryan religion, Indra held but an insignificant position, and hence he is unknown to the Zend-Avesta.[18]

Meanwhile a further development had taken place in worship. Priests were now divided into three classes, according as their work lay in prayer, singing, or action. Their several functions were allotted and determined respectively by the Yajur-Veda, the Sama-Veda and the Rig-Veda. The whole ceremonial was under the conduct of the Brahman. At the sacrifices there came into being a sort of ancestor-worship. Funeral feasts were also

17 Max Müller, *Essays*, ii. 71, 128. *Kirchenlexicon*, ii. 1186.
18 Roth l.c. p. 77. On the cultus, see Saussaye, p. 363.

established, at which the ancient Aryan belief in an eternal life in heaven was caricatured in gross sensual representations of the next life. The original idea of Soma, as the means of imparting immortality to the first men, as the tree of life, and as the strength of faith in old Vedic times, was materialized. Soma came to be regarded as the ambrosia offered to "hungry and thirsty gods," which inclined them to bestow divine gifts on men. Nay, Soma itself is personified and divine honours are paid to it. Besides being an element in sacrifice, it is supposed to come down from heaven, containing the germ of all life. Soma and Agni are so closely related as to be almost identical. The gods sink more and more in the background of the sacrifices, while ritual observances are pushed to the front. The need of forgiveness and of internal perfection is gradually lost sight of, and gives place to the naturalistic element. External formalism, worldliness, moral corruption, and paganism were on the increase.

Brahmanism was the outcome of philosophical reflection and speculation. It reduced the polytheism and nature-worship, that prevailed during the second period, to a strict monotheism, and to belief in an absolute personal being. It restored the primitive monotheism of old Aryan times. The belief in one infinite god was ever forcing its way through the polytheistic mist of the Vedas.[19] And yet a tendency to Pantheism was not wanting. All the attributes and properties of the godhead began to be clothed with oriental imagery, and were finally explained symbolically. Thus they became merged in the Absolute, without swallowing up in their current the different names of the several gods. Brahmanism is the religion of a caste, —the Brahmans. Its rule of faith is set forth in the *Brahmanas*, or commentaries on the hymns of the Vedas.[20] The Rig-Veda uses the word Brahma in the neuter gender for Prayer, holy

19. Max Müller, *Anc. Sans. K. Lit.*, 559. Fischer, p. 50, seq.

20. For the Literature see *Kirchenlexicon*, 2nd Edit., II., 1192. *Revue de l'hist. des. rel.* p. 246, seq. Roth, *Brahma und die Brahmanen Zeitschrift. der morgenländischen Geschichte*, I. 66.

action. Originally it signified growth. For, during prayer, people held a bundle of plants in their hands, (*barh* = to lift). It is now used in the masculine gender, and means one who prays, but is also used to designate the being to whom we pray (*Brahmanaspati*). Brahma seems to be a middle-being—standing midway between a personal God and the original cause of the world, from which Brahma has been evolved, and to which he returns. The resemblance between this and the former belief in the infinite in Varuna, is only apparent; the spirit of the old religion was gone. Only a shadow of infinity was left,—nothing in fact but the pantheistic world-soul in its progress through the universe. The process of evolution may be traced in the many changes of meaning that "Brahma" has undergone. "The religious development of India," says Roth, "has "for three thousand years hung on the woid Brahma."

The exclusive system of caste is a characteristic feature of Brahmanism. In later Vedic and post-Vedic times, and even in the Indo-Persic period according to Haug and Kern, who argue from the analogy of the four parallel castes among the Persians, the priesthood was reserved for a special class, the strictly exclusive caste of the Brahmans. The three other castes were debarred from the priesthood; the *Khshatrijas*, or warriors and chiefs; the *Vaisjas* (scions of the tribe) i.e. husbandmen, shepherds and artisans; and the fourth caste, known as the *Sudras*, who comprise the conquered serf population. Their lot may be gathered from the fact that, according to the most probable opinion, the system of castes was only fully established when the Hindus, by dint of hard fighting, were spreading themselves over the country watered by the Ganges. If, however, according to the other opinion mentioned above, caste originated in the Indo-Persic period, the *Sudras* were the labouring and servant class, and must be distinguished from the Indian aborigines (*Nishada*).

The Brahmans occupied an influential and commanding position. They subjected the people, the non-Aryan aborigines

included, to a state of social and religious bondage, varying in degree according to time and place, that is without parallel in history. And yet their purely sacerdotal and unpopular religion, and their elaborate ceremonial were unequal to satisfying the religious needs of the people. Even princes were constrained to do homage to the Brahmans, to receive praise or blame, reward or punishment at their hands. In their priestly character lay the secret of their power and influence. Both the doctrine of the Vedas and the nature of the sacrifice place the gods in their power. By righteous invocation they can compel the very gods to take part in the sacrifice, and shower down graces. When we bear in mind the pantheistic interpretation of Brahma, we cannot wonder at the Brahman being looked upon as a living god, a god among gods. Hence he is, in the higher sense of the word, a *persōna sacra*, worthy of all homage and thanksgiving. It goes without saying that Brahmans had duties commensurate with their privileges. As the very idea of caste implies, he must be of pure Brahmanic descent. His life must be blameless. His good works and his learnings should shine before men, and produce ripe scholars. In other words, by sacrifice and instruction, he is to raise up true disciples to Brahma. There are four stages in a Brahman's life. As a student he passes through a severe course of study; then he marries, and, in order to expiate the triple guilt in which he was born, he composes hymns, begets children, and offers sacrifices to the gods. Then he is free to retire from the world, and live as a hermit. The fourth stage is ascetical, and consists in reducing himself to beggary.

Laws and customs are fixed by a special juridical literature, that took its rise in the Vedas, The chief books of laws, of which we shall mention only the *Vishnu* and *Manu*, date from the Yajur Veda; others belong to the last centuries before Christ; others again are still more recent. As being Brahmanic writings, the books of laws are dominated throughout by

the spirit of caste. The rules of caste are their alpha and omega. The life of the Brahman is the burden of their song. Custom and the Veda is the source whence their jurisprudence is derived. The civil and criminal law is one, and based on the social relations that were in vogue in ancient times. As in all ancient systems of jurisprudence, punishments are severe and ill-proportioned. The connection of law with religion brought in its train the promise of eternal rewards, and the threat of eternal punishment. Belief in the transmigration of souls was a favourite Brahmanic doctrine. Those who committed certain offences had to wander through the various castes, and the wicked were to be born again in the bodies of animals. Suffering was a punishment for guilt contracted in a former life. Purification was effected by fasts and ablutions, and by reciting Vedic formulæ.[21] The Sutras, unlike the preceding literature, had a purely human origin, and carried these principles much further. In the Sutras the religious idea reached its nadir. To the Brahmanic precepts they added a domestic ritual, in which the life of the believer was regulated, down to the minutest details, from the day of his conception till death. It specified the duties of all classes: husbands and wives, parents and children, teachers and pupils, masters and servants, kings and subjects. In a word, they catered to the habits of one and all.

The copious philosophic literature and the various philosophical schools are entitled to a brief notice for two reasons: they are for the most part of Brahmanic origin, and, furthermore, they give an insight into the spirit that is even now swaying Indian speculation. To this literature the name *Upanishad* has been given. It should not be forgotten that it is not easy to fix the chronology of the several parts, which are separated by long intervals of time. A few of the Upanishads are part and parcel of the Vedic literature (Sutra). Thoughts of astonishing depth lie buried in an ocean of trivialities and puerile fancies. In

21 Max Müller, *Indien*, 1884. See Teichmüller, p. 537. Peach, p. 13. Saussaye, p. 370 seq. *Rev. I*, p. 247

them we meet for the first time the doctrine common to all Indian religions,—metempsychosis. Whether or no it be of earlier origin, it is quite foreign to the hymns of the Vedas. But philosophy reveals itself as a new religion, by the manner in which it applies this doctrine. For its chief aim and object is to liberate man from an everlasting migration, by absorption in *Atman*. Atman, whose colour ever varies, represents antagonism to the world of phenomena and deceits. He is the *ego*, the soul, the spirit, the reality, the absolute, in whom all apparent individual existence is swallowed up. From Atman and Maya (unreality, illusion) have emanated the world and the world-soul. Hence the promises, held out by the Vedas, of personal happiness in the world to come in the mansions of the gods, are valueless and unattractive to such a philosophy. The *summum bonum* lies in the complete dissolution of all individuality. Man realizes to the full sanctity and the supreme good, when he is set free from his accidental and individual surroundings. Life on earth is but an embryo. Death is the gate by which we enter into true life. In death the most perfect souls are swallowed up in eternity, and in the universal world-soul. With this philosophy was bound up a stoical apathy, which accorded well with the climate, and the natural temperament of the people. It also ushered in a reaction against the despotism of the Brahmanic priesthood.

Of the philosophical schools I shall mention only two: the *Sankhya* of Kapila, and the *Yoga* of Patanjala. Like the other schools they take their stand mainly on the Vedas. They have only one object in view,—deliverance from evil. India is the home of Pessimism. The world and human life are evils; knowledge is the deliverer. The Yoga, however, by admitting one supreme god as the ruler of all things, and by giving prominence to meditation and asceticism, may be considered a step in advance, although on this point opinions are divided. The name *Yoga*, according to some writers, signifies union, to wit, with God, with Brahma; whence it is inferred that the Yoga

philosophy was a noble form of mysticism, which made man's happiness to consist in loving and obeying the self-conscious absolute who guides his destinies.[22] Others see in Yoga the embodiment of an idea, extinct in the West, for which there is no equivalent in any European language. Yoga, they say, signifies an indescribable inward yearning for absorption into the infinite. The Western Aryans were swayed by a contrary impulse; to draw the infinite into themselves.[23] According to the first view, the desire to be freed from earthly encumbrances seems to coincide with freedom from sin, and in being like unto God in holiness and charity; according to the second opinion, it seems to lie in the attainment of superhuman power, and in lordship over nature.

This religion of Brahmans and other Indian philosophers was clearly not popular; it was the speculative and imaginative religion of a caste. Only when the people began to find satisfaction for their needs in popular religions elsewhere, was the Brahman dominion tempered, and its area circumscribed. Brahmanism is sometimes, in this respect, compared with the Middle Ages; but the two have nothing in common.[24] To the people the fantastic theories of Pantheism were incomprehensible. The life of individuals became utterly valueless. Sacred worship lacked a religious basis and aim, and moreover concerned only a privileged class. The element of reconciliation and redemption from sin, which so powerfully draws the popular mind, was wanting. In the Middle Ages, indeed, there flourished a privileged priesthood, not a caste. To the priest rich and poor, high and low had access. Priest and people, learned and unlearned professed the same faith. All had the same sacraments and sacrifice. All without distinction had a share in the Communion of Saints. Hence there could be no question of Pessimism, whether the word be taken in its proper sense, or as

22 Ebrard, *Apologetik*, 2nd edit., Güterslohe, 1874, vol. ii., p. 37. Saussaye, p. 379.
23 *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 1887, p. 262. From an account by an Indian (Morad Ali Bey) in the *Sphinx*.
24 Teichmüller, p. 528.

a kind of Optimism, inasmuch as the Brahmanic Pessimism had reference only to things external. Only a few off-shoots of ancient Gnosticism were grafted on a kind of Pessimism. Monasticism and Brahmanism, it is true, share in common the Indian love of solitude; but this is hardly a sufficient reason for labelling Monasticism as Pessimism.

This account of the Brahman monks is necessary to a right understanding of Buddhism and Jainism, which we now proceed to sketch. At one time it was the fashion to see in Buddhism a mighty revolution, in which the rights of man rose in rebellion against Brahman tyranny. Now, however, the History of Religion has made the discovery that Buddhism was not arrayed in hostility to Brahmanism, but that, on the contrary, each maintained friendly relations with the other. A sound historical judgment of Buddhism may be formed from the *Edicts of Asoka*, wherein special stress is laid on the toleration that Brahmans and Buddhists should observe towards each other. In the sacred books, the beggar-monk is named with as much respect as the Brahman. Nor, again, was Buddhism a democratic or social revolution, for the constitution remained unshaken and unchanged. Caste was retained in principle, but the ranks of of the monks were henceforward recruited from the *Khshatrijas* (Knights), not, as formerly, from the Brahmans. Both Buddhism and Jainism were *religious orders*, which had the king's sons for their founders. The difference between them centres in a single point. Jainism refused to establish religious orders for women, while Buddhism, though holding women in contempt, gave an unwilling assent. Both parted company with Brahmanism in denying all authority to the Vedas. But the denial of this authority was also to some extent the logical consequence of the ascetical system of the Brahman. Later on it was more or less put in practice. The Buddhist monks also led a community life in monasteries, and were formed into congregations, which subsisted after the death of their founder.

Jainism and the *Siddhanta* Canon (5th century A.D.), which

forms its literature, have only recently been brought to light. Was it started as an independent religion at the same time as Buddhism? or was it a sect that severed itself from Buddhism? These are questions that still perplex the learned, and to which no satisfactory answer has yet been given. Here, however, we may dismiss the subject, for Jainism has played only a subordinate part in religious life. Its adherents still hold their ground in India, and number about half-a-million. Its tenets approximate more closely to Brahmanism than to Buddhism, for, unlike the latter, it professes faith in *Atman*, and on this basis of universal being proceeds to divide all things into two classes: beings with and without souls. Nirvana, therefore, does not mean annihilation, but deliverance of the soul. As a means of deliverance the Jainas advocated not only faith in Jina, Knowledge, and observance of his tenets and precepts, but also an ascetical life, and even suicide.[25]

Sakhya-Sinha (lion), Sakhya-Muni (monk), Gautama, Siddharta of the race of Sakhya, as he is variously styled, was born at Kapilavastu. He was not, as is generally supposed, the son of a great king, but of a petty chieftain of Northern India. He founded that great monastic order which has exercised such a world-wide influence on the religious history of Central India—an influence that is still in full vigour. His death, or to speak in Buddhistic language, his *Nirvana* is usually set down to the year 543 B.C. This date, however, is now regarded with suspicion. The only account, to which we can safely allow the weight of historical evidence, is to be found in the *Fragments* of Megasthenes who, by order of Seleucus Nicator, was staying at the court of Tshandragupta from 306 to 298 B.C. The *Fragments* seem to turn the scale in favour of the year 477. From the recently discovered edicts of King Asoka, who was certainly alive in 256 and who died about 230, it has been inferred that the Nirvana of Sakhya-Muni was accomplished between 482

25 Saussaye p. 386. Barth, *Rev.* l.c. Kuenen, *Volksreligion und Weltreligion*, Berlin 1883, p. 276. seq.

and 472; others, however, bring it down to 410, and even to 388.[26]

The date of his death, however, presents but an easy difficulty in comparison with the events of his life. And yet it is of surpassing importance that these should be accurately gauged, as for some time it has been boldly and emphatically stated that they form a perfect parallel to the life of Jesus Christ. This assertion notwithstanding, it may be said with truth that our knowledge of Sakya-Muni, or to call him by the name given him on account of his reforms, of Buddha, the Illuminated, is almost a blank. The northern legends differ in essential particulars from the southern. By some the legends are explained mythologically, by others symbolically. A great deal cannot be explained other than symbolically. Even those who contend that Buddha's life has an historical nucleus, allow that solar myths are its environment. When his personality is unchallenged, his biography is merged in that of Krishna, Hercules or Apollo. His rank and dignity, his descent and parentage, his birth and home, his youth, marriage, and calling, his struggles and victories, in a word all the details of his life are engulphed in the myths of sun and storm.[27] Not that we are disposed to see myths in everything. On the contrary, we hold that the legend of Buddha in its entirety cannot be rightly understood unless it be assumed to be founded on fact. Nevertheless nearly all the details are not forthcoming till fully two hundred years after Buddha's death, that is, only two centuries before Christ. In view of these facts, we feel bound, at the outset, to protest against such an unauthentic life of Buddha being flippantly and malevolently employed in an anti-Christian interest. Against any minute parallelism with the life of Jesus, even when drawn by believing Christians, we are bound to enter our protest. There is no resemblance whatever between the two except on

26 *Revue* p. 253. On the other side p. 396, 543. Saussaye p. 347, 477. See Max Müller, p. 393 seq.

27 *Revue* p. 254. See Saussaye p. 407. Kuenen p. 258 seq.

the supposition that a real life of Buddha can be built up from contradictory and ludicrous details.

Monsignor Bigaudet, Vicar Apostolic of Ava and Peru, thus writes of Buddha: "The several incidents in the life of Buddha "cannot fail to recall many circumstances, described by the "Evangelists, in the life of our Lord."[28] The gods, it is recorded, had decreed to give a wonderful sign. About the feast of midsummer, Sakya-Muni was conceived of a beautiful, virtuous and immaculate virgin whose name was Maja. The whole world rejoiced at his birth, and the gods did him homage. Soon after his birth an aged and venerable ascetic, named Devala, saluted him, and proclaimed him the future Buddha. When he was eight days old, he received the name Siddharta. His childhood bristles with legends, which are even more improbable than the silly stories told in the apocryphal gospels of the child Jesus. After this no one will be surprised to hear that Buddha's schoolmaster marvelled at the knowledge he displayed. At the age of sixteen he lived in all his father's palaces, each in turn, with lovely maidens for his companions. He won his wife Yasadhora in a race, and she bore him a son Rahula. The gods now brought home to him the destiny they had marked out for him. On seeing a man bent with age, an invalid, a corpse and a monk, he knew these to be signs from heaven, and forthwith he resolved to renounce all worldly honours and pleasures. At midsummer he left the city, overcame the tempter Mara, who tried to turn him from his purpose, and then received from an angel the eight requisites of a beggar-monk, to wit, three garments, a shell, a knife, a needle, a girdle, and a sieve. With five other penitents, who had joined him, he now began to lead an ascetical and meditative life. As, after six years, the goal did not seem in sight, he again changed his mode of life, and took plenty of nourishment. At length extraordinary events warned him that the time was at hand, when he was to be installed as

28 Max Müller, *Essays* I. p. 279. See *Katholik* 1885, p. 630 seq. In Sauseaye the several parallels are drawn out.

Buddha. As he lay down under a tree, awaiting the advent of the supreme wisdom, Mara sought to stir up temptation, within and without, by means of his evil spirits and his daughters; but Buddha again stood firm, and would not yield. And he was rewarded with a triple gift; a vision of the past, and present, and an insight into the chain of causation. Then he uttered those memorable words, in which he declared that, "after many exis-"tences and painful regenerations, he had at length recognized "the builder of the house. Now, however, he would build no "other house, for Nirvana was attained." Then he went forth and preached in Benares, and disciples, even from among the Brahmans, flocked around him. In his native town he revealed his glory, and induced his own tribe to follow him. Nevertheless, during the forty years of his active life, he encountered opposition from his relatives and others. When he was now eighty years old, and was minded to give a parting admonition to his disciples, Mara tried to prevent him; and again Mara was vanquished. Being now fairly convinced that his work would live on in his disciples, Buddha calmly awaited death. After giving orders that he should be buried like a Great King, he died at Kusinara from the effects of eating roast-pork, which Tshunda, the smith, had set before him. The body was burnt. The disciples gathered up the relics and distributed them among the various chapels, where they were carefully preserved.[29]

This story, it is needless to say, cannot have been borrowed from Christianity; nor can it be assumed to be a remnant of primitive revelation. The main outline of the story—renunciation of the world and victory over the evil one—is so characteristically Indian, and so thoroughly oriental, that it must have a religious basis. The life of Jesus is, no doubt, also the life of one who perfectly fulfilled the task allotted to every man, of overcoming the devil and renouncing the world and its pleasures. But the perfect manner in which the task is fulfilled, and the several stages in the fulfilment, set a special seal on the

29 Saussaye, p. 404.

whole work. What a vast difference in this respect between the life of Jesus, from his Conception to the Ascension, and the legendary life of Buddha! The alleged resemblance between Buddha and Christ, when closely scanned, crumbles to pieces.* Buddha, though credited with a high degree of spiritual and moral excellence, is not put forth as a god in the proper sense of the word. A Deva appearing at four different times and under four significant forms, caused the king's son to be converted. Similiar appearances occur at intervals. Mention is made of endless grades of spirits, and of visible and invisible powers, but there is no one God who rules all things, and preserves all things in being. Buddha was also manifested in the fifth form, and will be manifested yet again five and twenty times. Still though externally honoured as God, he is not really God. It is idle to deny that Christianity, in the guise of Nestorianism, has brought influence to bear on Buddhism in China, as it has admittedly done in the isle of Patu.[30] On the other hand, it is open to grave doubt whether any connexion exists between Buddha's reformed monasticism and Christian religious orders. The search for the missing link in the Therapeutæ and the Essenes has failed. Buddhism may, indeed, as Lassen contends, have left its impress on Gnosticism, Neo-Platonism and Manichæism; but on this point again modern research bids us not to draw hasty inferences.

Buddha's life was set up as the moral ideal, at which his disciples were to aim. Their lives were modelled on his. The Buddhist Dogmatic System was built on him and his preaching,

* The reader may consult a recent article in the *New Review* for January, 1891, by Max Müller. In that article he tries once more to set at rest the fears of the weak in faith by assuring them that there is no connection between Buddhism and Christianity in the sense of one having borrowed from the other. They have nothing in common except the foundations underlying all religions. "Many things are alike,' he says, "and yet different in origin; many things seem unlike and yet spring from a common source," Again he asks, "If we are to suppose that Buddhism had reached Alexandria, and had filtered into Judæa, and had influenced the thoughts of the Essenes and other sects before the rise of Christianity, how are we to account for the diametrical opposition which exists between the fundamental doctrines of the two religions?"—Tr.

Revue, p. 353. Pesch. *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 1887, p. 17, seq.

his poverty and renunciation of the world, his virtue and his sufferings. This is a tradition bequeathed by North and South, handed down in the copious Sanscrit literature of Nepal, and in the less comprehensive Pali literature of Ceylon. The two have many things in common, notably the tripartite Canon or Tripitaka (three baskets). The three Pali canons are called *Vinaya-Pitaka Sutta-Pitaka, Abhidamma-Pitaka.* In general terms Buddhism may be described as an Agnosticism or Atheism that ignores speculative questions. Its denial of Atman is the chief point of difference between it and Brahmanism. Eternal substance and essential being, eternal life and the immortality of the soul have no place in Buddhism. God, redeemer and priest are, one in all, ostracised. The older Devas were purely allegorical. The names were retained, but the reality was abandoned; indirectly by Buddha himself, inasmuch as he is silent as to the existence of God, whereas his disciples directly deny it. The gods have no influence on man's destiny. "To the Buddhist a personal god is but a "giant spectre, like a horrible shadow that ignorant fancy has "cast athwart empty space." Every individual man is being dissolved into the universal nothing. Non-existence is the only true happiness. Nirvana or Dissolution alone gives rest, if Nirvana, as is usual, be taken in the philosophic sense and interpreted to mean pure and simple nothing; others understand by it a real existence in contradiction to this sham earthly existence.

Do the Saints survive or not after death? This was an open question which Buddha had left undecided. In the Abhidamma, Nirvana means an absolute cessation of existence. But in the more ancient and at the same time more authoritative books, in the Vinaya-Pitaka and the Sutta-Pitaka, and more especially in the Dhammagada, it bears quite another meaning. The law of *Karma,* by which is meant whatever accrues to the soul by its own activity, holds out the promise of a happier existence on earth. "If then the highest state in this life already constitutes

"a Nirvana, the Nirvana of the life beyond need not mean "annihilation. It merely precludes being born again. Death "affects only one of the five *Skandhas*, or qualities constituting "personality. It affects only material parts of the body (Rupa). "*Tanha*, or the last dying wish, transforms the other parts and "forces them to plunge again into the mire, and to be materally "born again. Thus the abyss of death is bridged over, and a "logical foundation laid for a new birth. In the new birth the "same individual comes forth again, but his chief parts and "Skandhas are newly distributed according to his deeds and "thoughts in his previous life on earth"[31] Meanwhile it should be noticed that the doctrine of the new birth can only be applied to Buddha's system within very restricted limits. If there is no soul and no individuality, if the soul, like matter, is devoid of essence, if, in short, all things are a combination of forces, and *fieri* is the only reality, what is left to constitute personal individual existence? Nothing but moral causality i.e. Karma, continues to live. If this be the eternal principle of life, regulating all the new births, till Nirvana is attained, then it melts into a mere abstraction. With matter Buddhism is even less concerned. Materialistic science is the middle grade in earthly development, and as it deals almost exclusively with the physical properties of matter, "six sevenths of its components and properties are passed over unheeded." But Buddhism transcends the material world. After death, the higher eternal self, the indestructible monad, having been purified in *Kama Loka* (purgatory), passes thence into Devachan or a spiritual heaven (where, however, the bliss is not perfect and eternal), and there all powers begotten during its life on earth are fully developed. Here it remains until the physical forces are ready for a new and higher incarnation. The cycle of all the incar-

31 *A Buddhist Catechism, according to the Canons of the Church of South India*, arranged by Henry Olcott, President of the Theosophic Society; Approved and recommended for the use of Buddhistic Schools by H. Sumangula, High-Priest of Sripada and Gallo in Ceylon. With notes of the American Edition by E. Cones, M.D., D.Ph., Professor of Anatomy. 1887. See *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1887, p. 311 seq.

nations is called Sansora. Like Nirvana it sweeps into its net the earth as well as the whole human race: God all in all. Such is ideal Buddhism, from which, however, everything personal and individual is eliminated.

Buddhism, then, denies creation. Its own theory is akin to Atomism. A strong wind condensed the atmosphere, and formed a mighty cloud, whence the sea emerged. The dry land collected on the surface of the sea. There are countless worlds cut off from one another, and wandering about in infinite space like souls. When the end comes, the world will sink into its original nothing. For the rest, Buddha exhorts his followers not to ponder on this finite and infinite world, but ever to fix their gaze intently on that alone which conduces to sanctity, and brings peace and enlightenment. Release from the sufferings of this life is the goal of the saints. This release, however, is not pessimistic, but gladsome. The *illuminati* find enjoyment in what they possess, and suffer without complaint the evils of this life. This doctrine of release is summed up in four phrases: suffering; the origin of suffering; the removal of suffering; the way to remove suffering.

Here, then, we get a good insight into the practical side of Buddhism. Originally Buddhism was not called a religion, but a philosophic guide to bliss.[32] This is true of the orders of monks, and also of the laity, whose chief duty it was to support the monks. But it is otherwise with the multitude to whom religion is indispensable. The monks or Buddha's own disciples find in Buddhism three treasures: Buddha, Dharma, Sangha. First and foremost is meditation on Buddha. Dharma, (i.e., law, doctrine) contains Buddha's preaching entire, and the cosmic and ethical system of the world. Sangha treats of Buddha's community of tonsured and bearded monks who live on alms. The decalogue is merely prohibitory, and contains no positive precepts. In the first five it is forbidden: to kill any living being, to steal, to commit adultery (in case of a monk to

32 Pesch, l.c. p. 20. Kuenen, p. 256, seq.

touch a woman), to tell lies, to indulge in intoxicating drinks. The five others are framed specially for monks, who are forbidden to have their meals at irregular hours, to take part in worldly amusements, to use ornaments or scent, to lie on a soft bed, and to receive money. It would be a mistake to regard this as genuine enthusiasm for the work of sanctification,[33] because redemption is obtained by freedom from suffering now, and not merely in the future; it is not merely as a means to an end. Moral actions and virtue are not the highest good or end, but merely a transitional stage. Not moral deeds, but negation stands at the summit. Buddha's compassion for human suffering is at best cold and icy. In spite of hospitals for the sick, and infirmaries for the brute creation, we fail to discern that he had even a faint notion, that the love of God and man is an incentive to virtue, and a motive for showing mercy. In Buddha's eyes suffering was something universal, not individual. His consolation always turns on the point, that others too are miserable. His only haven of refuge is resignation; not, indeed, the despair of the pessimist, but the presumed consciousness of deliverance. However estimable the Buddhist's struggles and strivings for moral ends, they fall short of the Christian ideal.

Christianity and Buddhism, it is true, have many moral precepts in common. Most of the moral truths contained in the Gospel are found in the Buddhist Bible. And thus it is clear that the human soul, which God has destined to lead a higher moral life, has many features common to all men. But the end proposed and the means employed are very different. In the Buddhist creed, man redeems himself from sin and misery; the divine reason that governs his body vanishes; he is ultimately without active energy, and is doomed to dissolve into nothing. What solution has Buddhism to offer to the problems about God and heaven, the end of man, bliss and immortality? To these questions Buddha gives no answer. Silence is equivalent

33 Teichmüller p. 406. Sydel, *Das Evangelium von Jesu in seinem Verhältnisse zur Buddasage und Buddalehre*, Leipzig, 1882. *Die Buddhalegende und das Leben Jesu nach den Evangelien* 1884. Compare Saussaye, p. 452.

to negation. Silence is the only consolation he can offer. What will it profit a man to follow Buddha? Buddhism is powerless to found a new active life. It holds out no hope. Schopenhauer and Hartmann have laboured in vain to set it on as high a pedestal as Christianity. The resemblance is only apparent. It is labour thrown away to compile Buddhist Catechisms, and scatter them broadcast in Christian lands, in order to show that there existed a religion of universal redemption before Christ, in the hope of winning disciples among Christian states and churches. He who has lost faith in Christ's redemption will not draw new life from the barren soil of Buddhism. To him who still believes in Christ, Buddhist redemption will seem superfluous.

The common people put their own construction on the meaning of Buddhist redemption. They imagined Nirvana to be a Paradise, and Buddha to be a god incarnate, dwelling in Paradise. Thus Buddhism never steered quite clear of Pantheism; and, moreover, it sought to accommodate itself to the religion of the nations with which it came in contact. What can people make out of a religion without God? of supreme goodness without a personal god? of continued existence without personal immortality? of bliss without a local heaven? of possible sanctification without a saviour and mediator? of redemption without prayer? of penance and pardon without the aid of priests or the intercession of saints? of self-deliverance from ignorance and sin? of the attainment of supreme perfection in this life? For the bulk of mankind such ideas are inconceivable and impossible.[34]

"And thus, it is necessary once for all to abandon the unsci-"entific assertion which boasts that Pantheism is the spirit, "which the Gospel has failed to conquer, and which dominates "the most wide-spread religion on earth."[35] In the case of Buddhism and of other Indian religions, whose roots are fixed in antiquity and in man's moral and spiritual disposition, the

34 *Theol. Quartalschr.*, p. 315.

35 Teichmüller, p. 442; see Mohnike, *Natur u. Off.*, 1886, p. 167.

work of Christian missions is handicapped, not by their Pantheism, but by their ascetic teaching. The Buddhist believes, that in the consciousness of sin, and in imitating the divine Buddha, and in working out his own redemption without priestly mediation or sacrifice, he already possesses all that the Gospel has to offer. Buddhists are as conservative and suspicious of innovations in religion as they are stationary, if not retrogressive, in their civilization. Their view of happiness begets Quietism and Indifferentism. The present condition of the countries in which Buddhism is in the ascendent, is an overwhelming proof that human wit and human power are inadequate foundations on which to build up the common weal. Hübner and other recent travellers paint in sombre colours the moral condition of the great Indo-Germanic and Mongolian tribes. Nothing but the Christian civilization of the West can quicken them into a new life.

Buddhism, being a sort of religious order, and having intimate relations with the common people, had great power of expansion. India soon lay at its feet. In the second century before Christ it had spread to Ceylon, Afghanistan, Bactria, and China. In the year 61 A.D. Buddhism was recognized by the Emperor Meng, as the third official religion of China. A Buddhist priest, a statue of Buddha, and a sacred book were brought over from India. From that time forward pilgrims and travellers streamed into India. From China Buddhism pushed its way into Japan, and in the seventh century into Thibet, and thence, in the thirteenth century, into Mongolia and Mantchouria, while, by a strange fatality, owing chiefly to the Islam invasion, it has been banished for centuries from the land that gave it birth. In the fourteenth century Tsongkhapa introduced into Thibet a special form with an elaborate hierarchy, which is known as Lamaism. The great dignitaries, especially the Dalai-Lama or Great Lama, who resides near Lhassa, are regarded as living Buddhas incarnate. The peculiar Buddhistic practices which bear some resemblance to practices in vogue in the Catholic

Church, are embodied in a still more elaborate form in Lamaism: monasteries, church-bells, rosary beads, images of saints, relics, fasts, church-music, processions, ablutions, confession, mass, thanksgiving services, sacrifices for the dead.[36] At first missionaries were thunder-struck by these similarities. The Abbé Huc's *Journey to Thibet* was placed on the Index,[37] because he mistook the outward semblance for the truth. After all, these customs are empty symbols without meaning; and, furthermore, the proof of their antiquity not infrequently breaks down. The symbolism is without doubt more recent. The attitude of the modern Science of Religion is worthy of notice. All sacred books but the Bible are assigned the highest possible antiquity, and the judgments passed on them are most friendly and favourable; whereas the Bible is mercilessly hacked with the keen-edged sword of criticism. Yet the questions as to older and newer portions, as to recensions and additions, are treated as open questions. The doctrine, morality and miracles of Eastern religions are so incomparably inferior to Christian doctrines and the miracles of the Bible, that it is the wildest dream to suppose these latter to have been borrowed from Eastern ideas and customs.

Later Brahmanism was swallowed up in *Hinduism*. This may, in brief, be described as the worship of *Vishnu* and *Siva*. The two great sects named after these two gods *Vaishnava* and *Saiva*, or the worshippers of Vishnu and Siva respectively, exercised a preponderating influence in Hinduism, without opposing Brahmanism. On the contrary Brahmanism received these sects into its bosom. The bond of union was the *Trimurti*,—a doctrine that is frequently held up as a parallel to the Trinity: but the two are really wide apart. At first blush it seemed a sort of modalism, as the Supreme Being is manifested at one time as Brahma the Creator, at another as Vishnu

36 Saussaye, p. 434.

37 Max Müller, *Essays*, I., 175. *Theol. Quart.*, 1858, p. 289 seq. In editions of the Index published between 1856 and 1873 the name does not occur.

the Preserver, and again as Siva, the Destroyer and Restorer. Brahma, however, makes a purely formal *début*; he really holds aloof, and is subordinate in rank. In Hinduism a popular religion supplanted the speculative religion of the Brahmans. Through its influence the Pantheistic mists and monistic cobwebs were dispersed. Man's personal needs and cravings for intercourse with a personal God were satisfied. These doctrines were, in their main features, old, although they cannot be recognized as such from the Vedas. Many diversified influences had been brought to bear on them. The aborigines, the Greeks, the Scythians, the Arabians, Afghans and Mongols had each, in turn, wrought their own changes. The Brahman distinction of caste, far from being abolished, was intensified and made more strictly exclusive. In course of time, however, there was a disposition to tone down differences. The origin of both these religions is buried in obscurity. Vishnuism had no historical foundation till the twelfth century. The history of Sivaism begins a few centuries earlier.

In the Rig-Veda Vishnu appears as the Sun-god, receding behind the other gods. In later times he was worshipped as the Creator, Sustainer and Providence. He assumes various bodily shapes, and as Saviour comes into closer contact with man. His various bodily appearances are merely by descent, not in the manner of real incarnations. In the early ones he takes an animal form; in the sixth he is Rama, in the eight Krishna, in the ninth Buddha. The tenth is still to come. His embodiment as Krishna is the most remarkable. A mere statement of the Krishna myth is sufficient to disprove any resemblance to Christ. Krishna was the son of Vasudeva and Devaki. He was brought up by peasants, and abandoned himself to sensual pleasure with the Gopi,—the wives and daughters of cowherds. His youthful escapades with shepherd maidens form the subject of many love songs. Many of his disciples have copied this ideal. These extravagances have excited no little astonishment in our own day. The founders of sects

wished to pose as incarnations and representatives of God. Thus the Godhead was brought nearer to man. The personality of God and man threw into the shade the old doctrine of identity. Man is united to God by Faith, Love and Devotion, —Bhakti. Neither knowledge, nor ritual, nor moral works make sanctity. The fundamental conditions of sanctity are resignation to God, absorption in God, and the mutual love between God and His servants. But the initiative must come from God. Vishnu—in his manifestations as Rama and Krishna, asserts his presence among men by helping them, by showering down his blessings, and by saving them. Man owes everything to God's foregoing grace. Whether man is a passive receptacle of grace, or lays hold of it as a young monkey seizes its mother, has always been a bone of contention. By favouring symbolism, and allowing images, animals and plants to be worshipped, Vishnuism satisfied the popular craving. Wonderful efficacy was attributed to the recitation of certain formulæ, and especially to the repetition of the several names of Krishna.

Sivaism has many points of contact with *Vishnuism*, but it has taken deeper root in Vedic literature. Siva steps into the place of Rudra, whose praises are sung in a hymn of the Yajur-Veda, as the god of mountains, of hearth and home, and daily concerns. He is the god who most endeared himself to the Brahmans. For a time his popularity in India was very great, as the Chinese pilgrim of the seventh century of our era, Hiuen-Tsang, bears witness. Siva is the supreme god, and his very person is the object of worship. Like Vishnu he appears under various forms to his servants. As a popular god his aspect is terrible. He has three eyes in his head, hissing snakes are coiled round his body, and skulls encircle his neck. He represents the dissolving and destroying as well as the restorative forces in nature. Hence the symbol, under which he is most commonly figured, is the Phallus, which is counted by millions in India. Siva is likewise a great ascetic, the great Yagi. Among the disciples of Siva are reckoned many great Yagi, who

have done wonders in bringing human nature into subjection, as, for instance, by standing for years on pillars, and taking scarcely any rest. His asceticism does not, indeed, preclude him from being in his way a Bacchus, hunting with jovial companions, drinking wine, and enjoying a dance with women. This gives the key to the wide-spread popularity of Sivaism among all classes. But the most prominent and at the same time the worst side of Sivaism is the worship of Sakti or female force. The worship of god is stifled by the worship of the great goddess (Parvati, Ambika, Uma, Durga, Kali), which had, indeed, a certain footing in the ancient Hindu cult. And a grim disgusting worship it is. The goddess drinks the blood of animals, and gnaws corpses. Unbounded licentiousness and magic go to form the worship. We have no wish to judge the ancient Hindu religion with severity; but we cannot but see in the orgies of Krishna and Kali a marked degradation, and a victory of popular passions over old thought and morality.

The cultus blends old and new in a most liberal fashion. Besides Vishnu and Siva there are spirits and demons who have also their part to play. The Ganges is held in high esteem. Animals (cows), snakes, trees, and lifeless things serve as fetiches. The temples erected to the gods are legion. Flowers, oil, incense and food are the gifts offered. Bloody sacrifices are also offered up to Siva and his consort. Nor are idolatry and prostitution forgotten. Images, which had no place in the old Brahman worship, are many and multiform; nay, "the limits of the possible and the beautiful" are too narrow to contain all the forms of images. Fasts and feasts abound. Music, processions and festal games add solemnity to the feast, and minister to dissoluteness.[38]

Here, too, a comparison with Christianity reveals more points of difference than of resemblance. The personal relations subsisting between God and his servants, and the personal presence of the incarnate God may possibly find their counterpart in belief in Christ, which rests on personal relations; these,

38 Pesch l.c.

however, are but the aspirations of a soul, christian by nature, which yearns for a personal God. A clue to their presence may be found in the monotheistic element in the Hindu religion, which was never wholly blotted out. Is it not probable, that the chief points proper to this period were borrowed from Christianity?[39] Nowadays Indian scholars are multiplying their efforts to establish a connection between the cultivated religion of India and the fundamental truths of Christianity: creation, the unity and spiritual nature of God, and the moral teaching of Jesus.

---

§ 2. The Iranians.

The Iranian religion is undoubtedly an offshoot from the common Aryan* religion. In the Indo-Persian period, when other branches had been lopped off, it was still in living union with the religion of the Aryans proper or Hindus. In the separation, however, the old plain form of the Vedas began to be cast off. The canonical books of the Iranians are the *Avesta* (text, law) or Zend-Avesta (science of law). This is divided into four parts: Vendidad, Yasna, Visperad, and Khord-Avesta. Both its thought and language indicate that it was the scion of a primitive stock. It betrays, to some extent, an overt opposition to the worship of nature, as sanctioned in the Vedas before the dispersion, and a straining after a higher and more spiritual Deity. The interval that elapsed between the Vedas and the Avesta was not a period of simple development. It is very generally allowed that it has left traces of a schism. The schism occurred not in Persia, as Burnouf holds, but in India, where the Aryans of the South-East had made their way over the Himalayas into the Punjaub. The Iranians

39 Weber, *Die Verbindungen Indiens mit den Ländern im Westen* (Indian Sketches); *Krishna's Geburtsfest (Abhandl. der Königl. Akademi*, Berlin, 1867). See Saussaye, p. 452, 456

* Aryan = Noble, faithful.

went forth from India during the Vedic period. If the Veda and the Avesta, as Roth insists, are two streams flowing from the same source, the Veda stream is fuller and clearer. It has run on along its first course. But the Avesta is a troubled meandering stream ; its course has been changed, and its windings are so intricate that it cannot, with any certainty, be traced back to its source. This remark, however, applies more to its theology than its ethics. The Iranian religion clung more tenaciously and for a longer period to monotheism, although it ultimately fell into dualism. Dualism derived support from the antagonism existing between Iranian and Turanian. This opposition began not between Indo-Germanic settlers and nomads, but between Indo-Germanic Persians and the tribes of the Asiatic Steppes. This is the burden of the Persian Epic.[40] On the other hand, the moral duty of man, barring certain ridiculous laws of purification, is surveyed from a higher vantage-ground.

Thus we may distinuish two periods in religion : the pre-reformation and the reformed periods. The former was natural religion, seasoned with the worship of light and fire. The sun, moon and stars had to take rank below the other gods, who belonged to the world of speculative reason. And yet it is by no means easy to draw a hard and fast line between the reformed and the unreformed. Anyhow the two rival gods, *Ormuzd* and *Ahriman*, form part of ancient Parseeism, because the antagonism of these rival powers forms the corner-stone of the whole system.

According to the Avesta, which was written between the fourth and sixth centuries, Zarathustra was the name of the reformer of the Iranian religion. By the Greeks he is called Zoroaster. He was born in Rayha, the modern Rai, the ancient capital of Media. Thence he travelled to Balkh, the capital of Bactria. Here he was entertained at the court of the Bactrian King Vistaspa who, be it noted, is not the same as Darius

40 Saussaye, p. 225 ; Pesch, p. 27 ; Vigouroux, III., 14.

Hystaspes. The time at which Zarathustra flourished is most uncertain, opinions ranging between the years 400 and 1400. The former date, however, is more probable.[41] According to the latest discoveries he preached his doctrine in Media, not in Bactria. Here we make no account of the extreme mythologizing tendency of Mazdaism. It may be frankly conceded that the ancient religion was not suddenly changed by the magic wand of one man. It may also be granted that, as in Brahmanism, Hellenism, and other religions, a change had been gradually working its way; still it remains extremely probable that Zoroaster brought about a reformation similar to that effected by Buddha and Mohammed. It is a piece of mythological jugglery to reduce Ormuzd and Ahriman, and Mithre, and the Amschaspands, and the legion of divine abstractions and dark powers to so many mythical formulæ; or to represent the doctrines of creation, resurrection and the end of the world as so many phases in the development of storm and aurora myths. In this case Zoroaster vanishes into thin air, as a matter of course. For what else could he be but an impersonation of the first man, the sensual man, who came down from heaven in the form of fire and lightning?[42] It is not a little remarkable that the Iranian religion is the one that most eschews all mythologizing of nature! The texts speak strongly against this view; ancient classic literature is unanimous in bearing witness to Zoroaster's personality. And here, as far as the verdict of antiquity goes, the matter must rest. To the ancients Zoroaster was too much of an historical personage in the flesh to be blown away by the breath of mythology.

In its cosmology, ancient history and devotional exercises (faith, prayer, good works, confession and sacrifice), Zoroaster's religious system bears a striking resemblance to the doctrines

41. Geldner, *Studien zum Avesta.* Strassburg, 1882. Roth, *Yasna*, p. 31, Tübingen, 1876.

42. Darmesteter, *Ormuzd et Ahriman, leurs origines et leur histoire*, Paris, 1877. Compare *Revue* de l'hist. des religions, 1880, p. 115. Against: Harlez, *Journal Asiatique*, 1878-1879.

of Holy Scripture.[43] Nevertheless, a close comparison of the Old Testament with Persian tradition has not been productive of any sure result. Here, again, it is well to be on our guard against mistaking external resemblances for internal harmonies. The Persian religious system is, indeed, monotheistic in origin, but it exhibits a declination to pantheism, nature-worship, and polytheism, and at last finds vent again in monotheism. Western writers were wont to consider *Zeruane Akherene*, eternal time, the supreme god; but he now turns out to be a creature of Ormuzd. The one passage in the Avesta that seemed to favour this view was mistranslated.[44] Only one Iranian sect is known to hold it.

Ahura-Mazda, whom Western writers call Ormuzd, is the supreme god. His name signifies most wise lord, the lord, the great wise one. He has a soul and a body. He created heaven nd earth. He is hailed as Father of heaven and earth, and dwells in the highest heaven. The most perfect of his creatures are the six Amescha-spentas (Amschaspands), or "the immortal saints." Next in rank are twenty-two genii, the Jazetas, "beings worthy of veneration," to whom the days of the month are dedicated. The visible creation was completed in six stages: heaven, water, earth, plants, animals, man.

Arrayed in open hostility to the good creation is an empire of evil. For every pair of good spirits, there is a corresponding pair of evil spirits. Antagonism to the Vedic religion peeps through the very name they bear,—Devas. In the main, dualism is the creature of external circumstances. Sometimes it is accounted for psychologically, by regarding the *ego*, on the one hand, as the good principle, because it sides with the good god; and the surging passions within man, on the other, as foreign to his nature, and stirred up by the evil one, and therefore as emanating from an evil principle, a god of the second power.[45] But this theory will not hold water, either in general

43 Fischer, p. 133-143.

44 Compare Ludwig Spiegel ap. Fischer, p. 114.

45 Teichmüller, p. 288.

or in this particular case, because the phenomena observable among kindred Indo-Germanic tribes are totally different. Parsee Hinduism is, indeed, tinted with a hue of dualism; but dualism, theoretically and practically developed, existed among the Parsees in very early times. It is far likelier that with change of abode, the hurtful forces and phenomena of nature, and national antipathies had instilled into man's mind the belief in an evil principle, and had brought home to him the idea of an evil god, before he had had time to theorize on the struggle raging within him, and to refer it to a dual principle without. Cosmological dualism was prior to anthropological. Here, too, knowledge begins with the senses.

The supreme evil spirit is called *Angro-Mainjus*, i.e. the smiting or destroying spirit. To the Greeks he is known as Ahriman. This name, however, does not occur in the hymns: in them the evil spirit goes by the name *Akem-Mano* or *Drukhs* (Drujas). He is almost equal in dignity to Ormuzd; anyhow he was not created by him. But he is inferior to him in power and, when time shall be done, he will be overcame by the expected *Redeemer* (*Sosiosch*). Ahriman is, in form, a serpent. Hell is his abode. He brought sin, death and evil into Ormuzd's good creation. He created evil spirits, the Devas, and subjected nature, in part, to his sway; whence a terrific war broke out between the spirits, and between good and bad men. All nature was drawn into the struggle. The good and their ministering genii battle for Ormuzd, and the wicked for Ahriman. Man's duty is to enlist as a soldier of Ormuzd. He may not defile the good elements: earth, air, fire and water: he must refrain from harming the good; he must foster and care for the good things of nature, especially the plants; but the bad he is to destroy.

Next to Ahura-Mazda, Mithra holds the highest place in heaven. He is the most powerful of the Jazetas, the high priest and mediator between god and man. He is the image and guardian of man and nature. Of the two chief feasts one is in honour of Ormuzd, the other of Mithra. Mithra's connection

with the sun made him an object of special favour with the Greeks, although Zeus, to whom the Parsees pay high honour, corresponds to Ormuzd. Mithra, according to Xenophon, is the sun-god. By him the Persians swear. Hesychius puts him on an equal footing with Ormuzd. To the sun-god horses were sacrificed; to Ormuzd, the creator, a bullock. The Avesta represents Mithra as a god driving in a chariot drawn by horses, and accompanying the Persians to battle. By degrees the sun-god almost supplanted Ormuzd, the Creator. At a later period, during the reign of the Sassanidæ dynasty, the whole worship lost more and more of its pure and ethical character and gave place to mere external formality. No Iranian deity enjoyed such wide celebrity as Mithra. In later times the mysteries of Mithra exercised a fascination in the West. In addition to Ormuzd and Mithra, there was a third god, *Sraoscha*, "the soul of Ahura-Mazda," the spirit. The trio, however, are as unlike the Trinity, as the Trimurti. These, then, are the "paternal," "kingly," "eternal" gods whom, Western authorities tell us, the Persian kings were wont to invoke in battle.

Dualistic ethics may be easily conjectured from dualistic doctrine. In the Vedas, the gods make war on the demons, that is, the battle is between light and darkness; in the Zend-Avesta, all that is good in the world of nature and of spirit is engaged in deadly strife with the power of the evil one.[46] Ormuzd is a holy god, who loves truth and purity, and commands what is right and just. Those who do good, who believe truth and the law, who expiate their sins by good works, and confess them to a Destur or priest, go to heaven, to Ahura-Mazda; the others go to hell.

For purposes of worship a special order of priests, called the Magi, was instituted. The Magi monopolised the sciences, and not infrequently occupied commanding positions in the state. Purifications were the alpha and omega of worship. Earth and water were clean. As temples and idols were unknown to the

46 M. Müller, *Essays*, i., 95.

Parsees, sacrifices were offered up in the open air, the victims being laid not on the ground or on an altar, but on a bundle of twigs. Owing to the belief in the resurrection of the body, they bestowed great care on the bodies of the dead. It was unlawful to lay them on or in the ground, lest they should come in contact with the earth. They were, therefore, suspended on stakes or left hanging from lofty towers, to be devoured by the birds of the air. This custom is strictly observed to this day by the Parsees, who now number several hundred thousand in India. Iranian theology teaches that the soul is judged three days after death. If it is found pure, immortality is the reward; and the body, too, after gaining a glorious victory over Ahriman, will awake in immortality. Hence the Parsees offer up prayer and sacrifices for the dead. The work is accomplished by the redeemer, who is called in the Avesta Saoshyanes or Helper. He it is who will break the power of the evil one, found a "kingdom of desire," and awaken the dead.

The sacrifices consisted of bread and meat. A significant part thereof was the drink of Haoma, which was held in high honour. Haoma is the same as the Hindu Soma, but the plant, from which this narcotic is obtained, cannot be exactly determined. There are two Haomas: the white and the yellow. The white flowed from the tree of life; the yellow is merely a substitute for the white. It is an emblem of the tree of life, and the means of restoring immortality. Like the Soma, the Haoma, besides being a sacrificial libation, was also a divine essence which imparted a healing force to the body and soul of the believer. It gives strength against the power of the devils, and leads to heaven. Missionaries were not slow to point out the great similarity that obtains between this sacrificial food, and the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, which also operates as a food, and a "medicine of immortality."

Zoroaster's reform was not allowed to run its course unchecked. Various causes were at work to shatter the old religion. The Magi were frequently ground down by Cambyses

and Darius Hystaspes. Doctrine was revolutionized by the myths of Zervan. Darius Nothus attempted to fuse into it the Egyptian and Persian religions. The changes introduced by Artaxerxes Ochus were gnawing at its entrails. Nor had Greek influence passed over trackless; it, too, had its share in undermining belief in the power of the gods.[47] In the year 226 A.D., the Sassanidæ, aided and abetted by the Magi, endeavoured to build up again the old dualism on a national basis, as it had existed under the Achæmenidæ. Then came Mani's abortive attempt to blend the same with Christian ideas. But Kings and Magi were up in arms. So violent was their opposition that in 277 Mani was crucified. Parseeism in turn was completely swept away by Islam. Only a remnant has survived in India. And it is with their aid that a better edition of the Avesta is now being prepared.[48]

The *Babylonian Captivity* is, to the apologist, the first and chiefest event in the religious history of Persia. During the Captivity Jews and Persians became acquainted. At that time the Medes and Persians were conquering Babylon. The fate of the Captive Jews hung on the sword of the Persian Kings. Speculatively considered, the religion of Zarathustra undeniably "approximates more closely to Mosaic Monotheism than any religion before Christ."[49] Nor is it historically unreasonable to suppose that the two religions influenced one another during that period. The modern history of religion is striving might and main to prove that scores of the religious ideas and customs of the Jews are traceable to this source. This "external foe" is said to have been a confederate of those monotheistic firebrands* (the prophets), whose idea of God was, in many respects, very similar to that of the Persians; for they, too, held

47 Döllinger, *Heidenthum u. Judenthum*, 1857, p. 451 seq. Friedlieb, *Leben Jesu*, 1887 p. 156. Schwane, *Dogmeng schichte*, vol. i., p. 645 seq.

48 Geldner, *Avesta, die heil. Bücher der Parsen*. Stuttg., 1887.

49 Windischmann, Compare, Pesch, p. 31.

* The German expression *Stürmer und Dränger* is scarcely capable of translation. The words are evidently borrowed from the period in German history known as the *Sturm-und Drangperiode*.—Tr.

sacrifice in abhorrence, and poured out prayers to their heavenly father, with naught but a flickering light,—symbol of the eternal Spirit.[90] But, we are told, it is most especially the idea of the devil, and a belief in bad and good spirits and angel guardians, that were borrowed from the Iranians. Are then angels and devils strangers to the Pentateuch? Does not the devil, disguised as a serpent, appear on the stage in the first scene in Paradise? Is not the part he played big with consequences? Are not Cherubim on guard at the gates of Paradise, to prevent man from returning to eat the forbidden fruit? The Book of Job and the Psalms discourse about good and bad angels in a manner which implies that they were a familiar topic. Even if the critical school should succeed in upsetting the common opinion as to the origin of the several books of Scripture, the passages referring to the devil and his ministers cannot possibly be set down to a period subsequent to the captivity or, indeed, to the captivity itself. At the same time it must be frankly conceded that, in the literature subsequent to the captivity, this teaching was further developed. The characteristics became more defined in the Jewish mind. The distinction between good and evil, God and the world, was more sharply drawn. God's creation is pointedly contrasted with the works of the devil. Herein lies the great influence that Iranian theology exerted on Judaism. What had been from the first a prominent feature in Old Testament belief was galvanized into new life. The Old Testament is the pure source whence have flowed the clear streams of monotheism, creation, the unity and omnipotence of God.

---

§ 3. Greeks.

With the Indo-Persian religion must be classed the Greco-Roman religion, which had been cut off from the common Aryan stock before the Persian, and being transplanted to a foreign

90 Teichmüller, p. 139.

soil, has produced still greater varieties. In this way, however, it influenced the whole growth of civilization, and served as a transition between old and new. Indo-Persians, Greeks and Romans were united in the common bond of Indo-Germanic descent. But the Greeks had something more. Their colonies and the conquests of Alexander materially qualified them to become, both in language and ideas, the intermediaries between East and West. The Romans also extended their empire to the countries in which these ancient religions had their seat.

In the Greco-Roman religion the gods were invested with human ideas, men were deified, heroes and conquerors had their apotheosis. All this is foreign to the old Indo-Germanic religion, and proves the two to be essentially distinct. And now heathenism had run its course, for it had sunk to its lowest level. Men were now enabled to realize that heaven had been dragged down to earth, that sanctity was besmirched with sin, that social life and morality were rotten to the core.

The religion of the Greeks has been variously described as "polytheistic and fantastic," as an "æsthetic refinement" of naturalism, as an easy-going view of life, and as a pantheistic deification of nature, inspired by a genial sunny climate. The influence of Asia Minor and the Semites stretched as far as Babylon, and can be proved to have acted at a later time on the Indo Germanic religious inheritance.[51] The names of many of their gods are traceable to the Devas, whom the Greeks, like the Hindus, and unlike the Iranians, conceived as good spirits. Uranus is Varuna of the older Vedic age; Eos, the Dawn, is the Vedic Usha. We may distinguish three stages in the development of Greek religion: nature-worship, the transformation of natural forces into families of gods, and the Greek mythology proper.[52] The ancient Pelasgi, whose capital was Dodona in Epirus, were nature-worshippers. Zeus, the god of the atmospheric heaven and the clouds, was supreme. His

51 *Revue de l'hist.*, 1880, II., p. 63 seq., 129 seq.

52 Welcker, *Griechische Götterlehre*, 1857–1863. Max Müller, *Essays*, II., 130 seq. *Wissenschaft der Sprache*, II., 404.

name carries us back to the monotheistic days of the early Vedic religion. Even the latter cloud-capped mythology was lit up by Zeus as the name of the supreme God. Belief in the existence of personal gods was so ingrained in Greek flesh and blood, that scarce anyone ventured to deny it. Later development was rooted in the ancient belief that God punishes evil and rewards good; that he is almighty, and guides all things to their end; that he is omniscient and omnipresent. Anyhow, this may be called the ancient, primitive natural religion. Though imperfect, it is of supreme interest, and is not lacking in at least a breath of divine inspiration.[53] Side by side with the *one* God, the father of men and heaven, nature was worshipped. The forces of nature, originally worshipped as such, were made to personify a family of gods, Zeus being king and father, with rivers and fountains for his sons and daughters. Pallas, surnamed Athene, the Beaming One, is the goddess of the blue sky. Pan (φαων) is the sun-god with the Arcadians, Phœbus (the Bright One) with others. Phœbus subsequently received the surname Apollo, from the Greek word ἀπέλλων, which means one who repels or wards off attacks. Dione or Demeter is the female germinative principle. Hera is the goddess of the dark firmament, Hebe of spring. Besides the sun-god there is Artemis or Helena, the moon-goddess, and Eos, the goddess of the dawn. Prometheus, originally Hephæstus, the god of lightning, is the god of fire. Hestia is the goddess of the hearth. The sea had for its god Potidaos, the Poseidon of later times. Dionysus presided over moisture and fertility. Darkness, sleep and death were under the divine control of Hermes.

And now the day had come when poetic imagination completely anthropomorphosed the primitive religion of the Pelasgi. The gods were dragged down into the turmoil of human life and passion. Theology assumed a polytheistic form, and continued to develop in this direction. Mythology

[53] Max Müller, *Wissenschaft der Spr.*, II., 388.

encroached on the old religion, and almost strangled it.[54] It was an excrescence, not a genuine growth of natural religion. Homer speaks in a lighter and less reverent strain. Through his picture of the life of the Olympic gods, there runs a vein of irony which contrasts strangely with the faith of bygone ages. It can hardly be questioned that Asiatics and Egyptians had a hand in constructing the Greek heaven. The colonies of Asia Minor are the connecting link between the natural rigidity of the Asiatic, and the flexibility of the Greek.[55] In saying that the ancient Greek theogonies were the creation of Homer and Hesiod, Herodotus did but give utterance to an historical truth. But it is also equally true that the poets only followed along the track which the genius of the Greek race had marked out. Pliny expresses the same thought in a more matter-of-fact style. "Human speech," he says, "invented many gods. Being unable to grasp the idea of perfection as a whole, man broke it in bits, and devised his own ideals and objects of worship."[56] Here the linguistic school scores; but the Folklorists are also partly right. Speech is both a seed and a flower of thought.

The poets did what lay in their power both to anthropomorphose and to degrade the gods. A noble and pure tone was lost. In natural religion the moral element was, indeed, at a discount; now, it was not only neglected, but set aside and divided. Ethics is the weak point in Greek religion. The merry Greeks never dreamed of approaching their deities with a feeling that they were sinful and unworthy. The older Greeks had no sense of sin or moral evil. Virtue, in their eyes, was something external; not a gift of the gods, but a work of man. The Greeks allotted bliss to gods, and virtue to men. It would, however, be unfair to impute this notion to the entire Greek world. Cicero's statement: *Virtutem nemo unquam deo acceptam retulit* is contradicted by classical authorities. Socrates petitions

54 Max Müller, l.c., p. 387, 425. Herodotus, iv., 2, 53. Compare also Rösler, *Prudentius*, p. 150. Mach., *Offenbarung*, p. 46, seq. Döllinger, *Heidenthum, etc.*, p. 63 seq.

55 Fritz, p. 211 seq. Saussaye, p. 145 seq.

56 *Histor. Nat.*, II., 4.

the Gods, first and foremost for inward beauty.[57] But, in truth, the pattern set by the gods neither called forth this prayer, nor invited imitation. On the one side stood Ares, the god of war; on the other, well to the front, was Aphrodite. In her more æsthetic capacity she is goddess of love and beauty; but immorality followed in her train. The family life of the Olympic gods—its intrigues and cunning, its passions and vices—is but a copy of human family life, and that not the noblest and best; for family life among the Greeks was a moral cancer. In depicting the gods, Homer has taken as his model *la bête humaine*. Laxity and irreligion were the natural outcome of immortalising the lower side of human life, and of painting sensuality in lively and gaudy colours.

Except among the Ionians, the transformation of the Greek religion into a formal mythology was beset with difficulties. The Dorians stoutly opposed the change, and thereby, perhaps egged on by Crete, implanted deeper religious ideas, which, from the time of Hesiod, centred in the worship of Apollo at Delphi. Self-knowledge and self-examination now figured as the fundamental conditions of religious life. The noble chord of religious consciousness was also struck. They did not ask for forgiveness, but they sought to atone for sin. Purity and redemption were recognized as needful on earth. Iranians and Egyptians typified victory over sin by the struggles between Ormuzd and Ahriman, and between Osiris and Typhon respectively. The Greeks carried that struggle into the human conscience, and thus made a step in advance from the impersonal to the personal. Still they were not within sight of any supernatural conception of God. Even the Ionians of Attica were driven to discard the repulsive human constituents of the Homeric gods, and to raise them up on a superhuman ethical pedestal. Apollo was promoted to be custodian of morals, Zeus protector of right, and Athene patron of good counsel, art and science.

57 See Saussaye, p. 109.

But philosophy had already broken the force of the attempt to improve religion. Its explanation of the world was atomistic and pantheistic. It mixed up theology with cosmogony, All was either melted down in the crucible of cosmology, or dissolved in doubt. From the sixth century, the movement of philosophy towards monotheism or rather monism gave rise to scepticism in the matter of traditional religion. Theagenes of Rhegium (about 520), Heraclitus, Theodore of Lampsacus, and others, made one supreme but vain effort to save religion by giving a wider interpretation to the myths. The naturalistic and pantheistic philosophy of the Ionic and Eleatic schools finished the work that the Theogony of Hesiod had begun, in preparing the way for the later scepticism. The gods, according to Hesiod, sprang from nature. Earth and Tartarus issued from Chaos. Earth (Gaea) gave birth to Heaven (Uranus), Pontus, and the twelve Titans. Cronus, the youngest of the Titans, was the father by Rhea of the Olympic gods. Cronus swallowed all his children, Zeus included, but was compelled to disgorge them. Then Zeus and his brothers made war on Cronus and the Titans, and Zeus reigned supreme. But though he appears as a person, he is in truth but a personification.

The havoc made by philosophy throws light on a remark of Protagoras: "I am not in a position to say whether the gods "exist or not. The way to this knowledge is blocked by the "shortness of human life, and the darkness which overspreads "it."[58] Although Pindar, Herodotus and Sophocles still clung to the old faith, rationalism and scepticism had eaten their way into Thucydides, Euripides, Aristophanes and Æschylus. The popular religion had fallen into discredit. Comedy counterbalanced tragedy, and scepticism cut the ground from under earnest philosophers. Euhemerism, so-called from Euhemerus of Messana, explained myths historically. Epicurus degraded Zeus and all the gods, held up their lives and history to ridicule, and deified men. Importance was no longer attached to oracles.

58 See M. Müller, l.c. II., 389. Dollinger, p. 254, seq.

Chrysippus and Œnomaus mercilessly laid bare the untrustworthiness, ambiguity, and absurdity of the responses; no was the subsequent advocacy of Plutarch and Sextus Empiricus of any avail to save them.

But we have been anticipating events. In the history of Greek religion and philosophy, the name of Socrates towers above all others. He was a believer in the national religion and a doer. Xenophon bears witness that his master was religious. All hangs on the mysterious Daemon, who guided him from youth upwards, and kept alive his faith in divine revelation and religion. It was the Daemon, the divine something (δαιμόνιον, θεῖον τι), which he felt within him, the contact with divinity, which made Socrates a true believer.[59] While some ignored their country's gods, and others, like Herodotus and Pindar, were striving to make them more palatable by giving them a more refined appearance, Socrates sided with neither party. Allegorical interpretations he branded as foolish. To the religious education of the Greeks he gave a new direction, by bringing it into conformity with the worship at Delphi. He told men to look into their own hearts. He tried to persuade them to keep free from the turmoil and bustle of the world; thus he hoped to compel them to look into themselves. Thus a foundation was laid for the moral life of man in his own personality. And what was the upshot? Socrates was condemned to drink hemlock for despising the gods.

Plato has vindicated the character of his master; and Plato's philosophy is a splendid apology for his master's teaching. In his writings there is a noble inspiration. He takes wing and soars on high. One is almost tempted to say he had the divine genius of a poet. How noble his ideal of the wise man! How skilfully he depicts his freedom from self-seeking, sensuality, and evil desires! See his picture of the wise man who heroically suffers evils he had not deserved! How pathetically it speaks to the heart of the reader! Is he not in very deed antiquity's

59 *De l'influence du démon de Socrate. Revue de l'hist.*, 1886, p. 47.

great "prophet of redemption?" Unhappily Plato could not clothe his life-like pictures with flesh and blood. He does not tell us how his ideals are to be realized. Alas! how many mangled shadows cross his noble teaching, and dim the bright colours in which his life is painted! Even Socrates, as pourtrayed by his enthusiastic disciple Xenophon, according to strict moral motives, was no virtuous hero. But Plato was still more under the sway of the moral shortcomings of the day. Did he arrive at the knowledge of the one true God? This is a question about which philosophers are still wrangling. The idea of *absolute goodness*, which was his supreme being, shewed that he had attained a high moral conception, which found vent in a desire for purity, holiness, and redemption. But Plato never travelled beyond ideas, and his ideas were almost nullified by his low estimate of morality. He upheld slavery; he degraded woman kind; he raised his voice but feebly in condemnation of unspeakable vices which, among the Greeks, at that time, passed as refinement. All this, and much more to the same purpose, is full and overflowing proof that the noblest representative of Greek philosophy, "Christian Plato," was powerless to stem the torrent of religious and moral decline.

Is Aristotle, perchance, more Christian? In the work of regeneration Aristotle was as unsuccessful as Plato. His idea of God is unmeaning, rigid and lifeless, and is of no practical utility for daily life. Plato's notion of a divine providence was inapplicable to Aristotle's god, who was ever busy with his own thoughts. Through the severe condemnation he passes on women, slaves and barbarians, there peers the haughty Greek, who despises the rest of the world and gauges morality by station and external surroundings. In his view, man, so far as he is a member of the state, is a ζῶον πολιτικόν; but in himself he is nothing. The Tragedians took a serious view of life; but their writings are congealed by sadness, and soured by melancholy. There runs through them a tone of sullen resignation and despair, and of a dread fatalism which even the gods

cannot escape. If these things were done in the green wood, what, think you, was done in the dry What was the religious and moral condition of the masses? A slavery reeking with immorality, woman in ignominy, public institutions for prostitutes of both sexes form a parapet from which we can look down into the seething cauldron of corruption. Pleasure, as embodied in Epicureanism, was the lode-star of the classes; exploitation and oppression were the lot of the masses. Stoicism, indeed, marked a reaction. Better and nobler natures tried to find in man's own inner self a motive for virtue, nay, to make virtue man's only end and duty. But Stoicism again ended in self-glorification or self-deification. As a last resource suicide was recommended as a means of preserving virtue and dignity. None but the biassed opponents of Christianity can see in the suicide of the Stoics a parallel to Christian self-sacrifice, and the Christian desire of martyrdom.[60] The Christian's love for Christ and longing for heaven has nothing in common with that act of despair. The consciousness that the old religion had been weighed in the balance and found wanting was deepened and intensified, but Stoicism was powerless to utter the true and saving word. Human nature shrinks from an apathy that does not spring from high motives. Virtue without reward had no attraction for the natural man. St. Paul's description of heathen sinfulness reveals the impassable gulf that separates heathen and Christian morality. Still, at that time, Stoicism had a large following.

The Greeks found in *Mysteries* a compensation for the redemption they had sought in vain.[61] After the introduction of Orphic rites and the cultus of Apollo, Asiatic and Egyptian mysteries had been gaining a greater hold on the people. They were designed as a confession of sin, and a yearning for redemption. It was generally felt that man needed to be assured that

o Fritz, p. 342.

1. Compare, besides the works of Welcker, Preller in *Pauly's Realencyklopädie*, 1839, v., 311, seq: Döllinger, l.c., Fritz, p. 245, seq.; Mach, p. 39 seq.; Bratke, *Theol. Studien u. Krit.* 1887, p. 654, seq.

sin was really and truly expiated. And, as the popular religion furnished no such security, men had recourse to mysteries which were charming in their secrecy, and, in a measure, stilled the qualms of conscience. Mysterious, symbolical and palpable rites exercised a fascination over the people. But the educated also longed for a religious resting-place. Mythology and philosophy had proved ineffectual, and lay in ashes. Men were wandering in the dreary desert of scepticism. Henceforward mysteries became an essential part of religion, and found a place even in Neo-Pythagoreanism and Neo-Platonism. With correct religious instinct men found that the will, not the understanding, as it was heretofore supposed, was the seat of sin. Sin was no longer regarded with indifference as something unavoidable, and easily pardoned, and punished, like all foolish actions, with misery and want. But it came to be regarded as a transgression against God and conscience, which must be atoned for, either in this life or the next, unless God himself graciously pardon it. Belief in a future life and retributive justice held out an anchor of hope to men floundering in a flood of misery. It also opened out a joyful prospect into the world beyond, and did not, like the philosophical schools, beguile men with the false goods of this life. Thus the better-minded, discontented with the popular religion, joined the Eleusinian mysteries, which promised redemption and salvation to troubled souls. Atonement for error was the only goal of the popular religion: but the mysteries aimed at influencing the will and purifying the soul from sin. From God's pardon they promised peace in this life, and the consolation of being purified and forgiven in the dark life beyond the grave.

But what real lasting benefit did the mysteries confer on the initiated? They did little or nothing but produce a stunning, stupefying effect on excitable natures, by means of the charms that lay in their symbolic images, and ideas, and grotesque exaggerations. A play was acted, calculated to excite the fancy and captivate the senses. Lustrations, sacrifices, and

exhortations to dutiful behaviour followed. Lively caricatures of deities who were supposed to report man's doings on earth to the other world; secret nocturnal feastings; religious songs and dances might well stupefy and silence the heart, but they could not set it at rest for ever. These horrible Asiatic orgies ought, no doubt, to have given way to a purer view of religion, in order to satisfy man's need of the peace arising from a true and enlightened piety. But how could this be done, as long as the one thing necessary was wanting, viz., faith, and real forgiveness of sin? It is still an open question whether the mysteries had merely a moral significance and referred to sin, or whether they had also a religious meaning and presupposed immortality. We are fully alive to the good work done by the mysteries in awakening the consciousness of sin, but we do not, therefore, feel it incumbent on us to set great store by them. The Athenians, for instance, were generally eager to be initiated before death. This was, indeed, tantamount to acknowledging that the popular religion could not offer much consolation to those on the brink of the grave. But the fact that initiation was regularly deferred till the hour of death seems to detract largely from their moral effect and sincerity. Socrates was not initiated, neither did he speak in favour of the mysteries. Plato, the champion, not of myths, but of the state religion and the dignity of the priesthood, expressly censures them. One of the subjects represented in the mysteries was the wanderings of Ceres in search of Proserpine. This Plutarch explains astronomically, Ceres being the earth, Proserpine the moon. The ancients, he tells us, instituted mysteries to train themselves to observe in political life the secrecy that was binding in religious matters. The Christian apologists, many of whom had been initiated before their conversion,[62] so far from regarding the mysteries as a preparation for the gospel, saw in them the stronghold of heathenism, and a hot-bed of the most corrupt and immoral superstition. Any one can see at a glance how

62 Mach, p. 42 seq. Bratke, p. 656.

widely they differed from the solemn mysteries of the apostolic churches. Some, indeed, profess to be reminded of the Greek mysteries by the manifestations of gifts at Corinth; but there is absolutely no comparison between the two. But S. Paul's description, which is void of all reference to effective symbolism, or other sense-representations, points out an essential difference.

Some of the faithful perhaps set too great store by the gifts, and regarded the outward sign itself, instead of the thing signified. The apostle, however, points out the right path. Without disparaging the gifts themselves, he says that they are one and all given for the purpose of edification, for building up the spiritual and moral temple. The Christian assemblies did not indulge in dramatic exhibitions, but were characterized by a deep religious belief, and a moral earnestness that stamped them as holy. So the two have nothing in common but secrecy. Secrecy might facilitate the performance of divine service in the Christian assemblies, and might also have the effect of bringing those who were discontented with the mysteries, into the Church. But, even in this respect, the preparation for Christianity was chiefly negative. The hierophants were, for various reasons, the bitterest and most envenomed enemies of Christianity.

---

§ 4. Romans.

Roman and Greek Theology are almost identical. Roman philosophy is an offshoot from the Greek. The bumps of invention and speculation were not largely developed in the Romans, who rather excelled in power and endurance. Hence Roman religion was essentially a creature of the Roman State and, in the end, lost all religious significance. Priests were state officials, and sacrifices were acts of state; both continued to eke out an existence long after people had ceased to believe in one

or the other. Politics was the horizon of religion. Janus and Jupiter Mars and Quirinus, with a host of hearth and household gods as attendants, were the supreme divinities of the state; but the Romans had no scruple in allocating a niche in their Pantheon to the gods of conquered tribes, in order to facilitate submission to the new order of things, and to ensure their political conquests[63]. Thus, while gradually annexing Greek dominions, they exalted Greek religion and philosophy, life and language. As Alexander the Great had paved the way for a universal religion by propagating Greek thought and manners in Asia, so the universal empire of Rome, with its splendid organization, was the agent, under divine Providence, in propagating Christianity, and in preparing the heathen world to receive it. Mankind was more disposed to hearken to the gospel which taught that all men are equal before God, and that men must love their neighbours, when an universal language had enabled the nations to hold intercourse with one another, and when an universal empire had broken down the barriers that separated one people from another.[64]

The Roman religion however, degenerated even more swiftly than the Greek. For Greek philosophy brought Greek scepticism in its train into Italy. Ennius (200 B C.). taking pattern by the Greek sceptics, degraded the Roman gods to the rank of deified men. Jupiter alone was spared, and he remained only as a volatile pantheistic conception. What clearer proof can be given that Roman religion was effete than the fact that all the Eastern cults, including that of the Jews, found a home in Rome itself? About this Tacitus utters loud and bitter complaints. To women the mysteries were especially attractive. Philosophers and archæologists have strained their eyesight in trying to see Greek and Roman life in a better light. They have insisted that the sketches of a few frivolous Augustan poets and discontented satirists cannot be received as evidence. Let it

63 Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 25. Weiss, *Apol.* I. 195 seq.

64 Comp. Prudentius ap. Rösler, p. 297, 303. Döllinger, p. 463 seq.

be granted, for argument's sake, that these men purposely held up blotches and faults to the public gaze; and, furthermore, in keeping with what S. Augustine relates about many heathen country folk who refused to be baptized because they were not conscious of any sin, that the masses, especially in the country parts, led better lives. Nevertheless, we must look the fact fairly in the face that grave historians, of the calibre of Tacitus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus give a frightful picture of the universal decline in morals, and of corruption in public and private life. Here are some of the scenes in this chamber of horrors;—Slavery gnawing the entrails of morality; education grossly neglected; unbridled licentiousness, which utterly destroyed the former position of woman, and which no legislation on marriage could check; the shameless example of the higher classes and emperors; the cruelty of the multitude nurtured in bull-fights and gladiatorial shows; unblushing shamelessness in the theatres. Does not this and much more to the same effect conjure up an awful picture of life in that age?[65] In a secret cabinet in the Naples Museum, screened from the public eye, are specimens of the nude figures dug out of the ruins of Pompeii. Finally the *apotheosis of the Emperors*—a political measure brought in by Augustus and speedily passed,[66] when the universal state-religion was grafted upon the old popular religion—deprived religious belief of its true and natural foundation. The Stoics strenuously opposed the measure. But what was Cato against a multitude? Seneca has left piles of beautiful moral prescriptions. Their similarity to the precepts of the gospel has led some to imagine a correspondence between the stoic philosopher and S. Paul.[67] But the two are in accord only in general thoughts on immortality and moral ideals; and very often the agreement is apparent rather than real, is in the

65 Compare Mach, p. 93. Also Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*, and Döllinger, p. 694. Weiss, I., p. 36.

66 *Revue de l' hist*, 1860, p. 161. Friedlich, *Leben Jes*, p. 161.

67 Kreyer, *Annaeus Seneca und seine Beziehung zum Urchristenthum*. Berlin, 1887. Teuffel, *Römische*, *Literaturgesch* 3 Ed., Leipzig. 1875. No. 287.

letter, not in the spirit. No apologia will ever wholly clear Seneca's character. His scandalous connivance at Nero's vices, and his excessive attachment to earthly goods set his consoling stoic maxims in a lurid light. A Stoic in theory, he clung to the world as tightly as he could. Even Teuffel thus sums up his character: "In the versatility of his "genius none but Ovid can compare with him. At the same "time he was keenly alive to his own excellences. He was "not always proof against the suggestions of the moment, "or the temptations which power and opportunity put in "his way. Still he very seldom scandalously abused his "great gifts or his high position. And if in life his wis-"dom was often diluted with shrewdness, still in death he "manfully renounced the goods of this world."

At the close of the first century the Roman Emperors set to work to renovate paganism.[68] To quicken the religious sense, to transform polytheism into monotheism, to satisfy the cravings for penance and expiation, to stimulate the desire for revelation and eternal life in the world to come, and to gratify the desire partly by means of Oriental mysteries,—such was their programme and aim. To enable the lower classes to take a part in religious life, *collegia tenuiorum* or religious brotherhoods were established. It was also hoped that by this means the idea of a universal religious brotherhood—of all peoples united under one head—would gain strength and currency. For the educated, Neo-Platonism offered an excellent substitute for the faith that was lost. But, as history shows, these attempts failed to stay the hand of dissolution; their only effect was to throw the better disposed Pagans into the sphere of Christianity. Christianity, being a real living force, and deriving its authority from above, overcame Paganism even in its regenerate form. Paganism made one supreme effort under Julian which extorted from the dying apostate the notable confession that Christianity had conquered. Henceforward the heathen, who had for three centuries trampled Christians under foot and treated them as

68 Compare Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I., 80.

enemies to the state, were content to crave forbearance and toleration for their lost cause.[69]

Is it right, however, to weigh Greeks and Romans in a Christian scale? Should not public and private crimes be laid at the door of two factors of heathenism: the ancient idea of the State, and the position of women?[70] Whole nations were weighed down by the State-idea. The noblest and best citizens were forced to bend the knee before it. Slaves had no rights. The idea of loving one's neighbour had not been thought of. Education was bad. Faith had vanished, and hope in a future life had gone with it. Paiderasthia and concubinage were universal. Even if the State-idea and the position of women were the chief sources of the evil, we must still ask whence came the State-idea and the position of womankind? Or, is it mending matters to draw a parallel from the black pages of Church history, and exclaim: Man is no better to-day than he was before! Of course human nature is the same to-day as it ever was. In himself man is no better, but the believing Christian is far better than the best of the heathen. *Corruptio optimi pessima.* A Christian, whose life is a scandal, is a tremendous failure. But no man, not steeped to the eyes in prejudice, will dispute that Christians in the first three centuries stood head and shoulders over their heathen persecutors. Those Fathers of the Church, who had personal experience of both heathen and Christian life, are assuredly the best judges. We will only quote S. Cyprian's letter to Donatus. Cyprian holds religion accountable for immorality. "Unhappy men, they "imitate the gods they worship, and thus crime becomes an act "of religion." The cruel gladiatorial shows, the infamous theatricals, the secret crimes, justice polluted in its source, frightful tortures, the pursuit of money at any cost, should, in Cyprian's opinion, convince anyone that heathenism is wrong. Even things, seemingly good, are tipped with poison. Honours,

69 Compare Schultze, *Geschichte des Untergangs des griechisch römischen Heidenthums*, Jena, 1887.

70 Fritz., p. 32, seq.

riches and power, can no longer bring contentment. All things are brimful of uncertainty, and overshadowed by fear. And now let us turn to the other side of the picture drawn by the same hand. Christians had a different idea of the State, hence they became its victims. Woman occupied an exalted position. The soul of a slave is as precious as that of his master. Here is a huge difference that has to be explained, not explained away. In later periods Christianity has not always shown the same quickening and ennobling power on the tribes with which it has been brought in contact; not that its inward force is less, but that external obstacles have marred the effect. Backslidings notwithstanding, true civilization and progress go hand in hand with Christianity. Surely this is somewhat strange! We are forbidden to appraise the lives of the Romans and Greeks, who lived before Christ, according to a Christian standard, and in the same breath we are assured that man is no better now than he was then! Perhaps, Christianity after all is something superhuman.

---

§5 The Germans.

The Germans were also a branch of the great Indo-Germanic stock, but their religion, as described by Tacitus, and handed down in North-German sagas, has more affinity with the purer Oriental nature-religion than with the religion of ancient Greece and Rome. The religion of the Germans was also a religion of nature. Light, fire and earth, groves and forests were the objects they worshipped. The German worshipped his god in groves, and under the vault of heaven. Edda theology centres in Othin or Odhin, who is regarded by some as an historical personage, by others as a personification of the doctrine brought from Asia to the North. Parsee ideas have, undoubtedly, found their way into the Edda. Wodan (Mercury), Thor or Thunär, and Freia were subsequently held in especial honour. Fetcihes

were not uncommon. They had low ideas about a future life, but pure notions of morality. Tacitus, in his *Germania*, in a manner held up German morals as a model, perhaps for the sake of offering a sharp contrast to Roman immorality. Anyhow, from the facts therein stated, it is clear that their chaste, though not sober, life, the high position of woman, the fidelity and courage of the men, won the admiration of the proud Roman foe of Germany.

CHAPTER III.

THE HAMITES AND SEMITES.

From the descendants of Japhet we pass to the Hamites and Semites, the Chinese religion serving as the bridge on which we cross from the one to the other. For the Chinese religion took its rise near the original centre of the Aryan religions, and, moreover, by means of Buddhism, was brought in touch with the religious development of India.

1. The Chinese.

The Chinese[1] are one of the most remarkable among the civilized nations of the East. They have an historically authenticated tradition that stretches as far back as the year 3,000. Emigrants from the North-West, they belong to the Mongolian race and are, in all probability, of the same kith and kin as the civilized tribes of Western Asia. Their civilization, like that of most Aryan tribes on this side the Ganges, is very peculiar, and in many respects most remarkable. Not only is their civilization most ancient, but, unlike that of other peoples, *e.g.*, Phœnicians, Assyrians, and Babylonians, it has, with some modifications, withstood the ravages of time. Their history, from 2,356 to 947 B.C., is told in an historical document called

1 Compare *Revue de l'hist.*, 1880, p. 346 seq. Saussaye, p. 232 seq. Mohnik, *Natur u. Off.*, 1886, p. 167.

Shu-king. We have, however, less knowledge of their ancient religion than of their ancient history. What remained of it in the sixth century before Christ was, with some changes introduced by himself, digested by Confucius into a volume. The Chinese are as little conservative in their religious ideas as in their politics. About the year 213 B.C., a Chinese emperor ordered all religious books to be burnt. Hence the religious notions of antiquity could only be gathered from tradition, as modified by Confucius. A few copies of Confucius' version of the Shu-king, though injured, were saved from the flames. The ancient national literature of the Chinese is also rich in songs, mostly of the popular sort. *King* is the name given to the sacred books, to mark the high esteem in which they are held They are called canonical, because their character and number are fixed by a kind of canon,—not, indeed, by a religious authority, for this no longer exists, but by the authority of the emperor and the learned. The *Kings* are divided into two sets: the greater and the lesser. The greater go back to the early dawn of Chinese history, and contain primitive universal traditions, revised, as is supposed, by Confucius. The lesser *Kings* were composed by the disciples of Confucius and other learned men. The canon of the great *Kings* was first fixed under the Han dynasty, (206 B.C.—220 A.D.) It comprises the Yi-King, the Shu-King, the Shi-King, the Liki, and the Tshunthsieu; this last being the work of Confucius. The Hiao-King is also a classical book The four Shu, which in the main expound the teaching of Confucius, are books of a secondary rank.

In the thirteenth century, travellers, with Marco Polo, at their head, were the first to bring the West into communication with the Central Empire. But since the sixteenth century, we are indebted to the zealous and learned Jesuit missionaries, whose linguistic and historical works on the Chinese are still the groundwork of the knowledge that Europeans possess of this peculiar people.

Three Chinese religions must be carefully distinguished. The first or natural religion is lost in the twilight of prehistoric times, and coincides with the early life of the people.[2] The Chinese first appear in history as monotheists. The belief in one supreme God, in spirits, heavenly, earthly, human, or ancestral, and especially in good spirits (Shan), and consequently the belief in the immortality of the soul, and eternal rewards, formed the groundwork of their religion. Sacrifices and extensive ancestral worship were part of the worship of God. State officials performed the acts of worship as there was no special priesthood among the Chinese. To the emperor, however, belonged the right of offering the great sacrifice to heaven Animals, fruits, and incense were offered up in the sacrifices. The name of the god of heaven was *Shang-ti*, which signifies supreme master and sovereign lord. The compound name was chosen with a view to remove the ambiguity that necessarily attaches to the monosyllabic words of the Chinese language. The disyllabic name is a name in the full sense of the word, and is perfectly clear. Renan is quite mistaken in asserting that there is no Chinese name for God.[3] *Shang-ti* is even a better name than Θεός, *Deus*, and *Dyau*, inasmuch as it admits of no plural. Kings often search for manifestations of God in nature, in rain and sunshine, in heat and cold and wind, and so forth. The order of nature, state and family constitute the foundations of religion. The epithet Thian, or highest heaven, when applied to Shang-ti, no more means the material heaven among the Chinese than among the Hindus, for they never lost sight of the personal relationship involved in its good and evil action. It is Heaven that punishes and rewards, that blesses and curses. It makes its will known by the voice of the people: *vox populi, vox Dei.* The names Shang-ti and Thian are often interchanged in the same sentence. It is therefore

2 Vigouroux, *Controverse*, 1884, I, 3 seq. Harlez, 3 *ib.*, 1885, p, 529 seq.

3 See M de Hervey, *Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres*, 4 fevr. 1887. *Controverse*, 1887, p. 479 seq.

reasonable to contend that the primitive religion of China, the religion of Judæa excepted, was the most perfect and spiritual monotheism of the ancient world.[4] The inscriptions bear witness to the same fact. It was only towards the beginning of our era, when the Hans were still reigning, and Buddhism was making steady progress, that the practice of representing spirits by visible signs first came into fashion. In the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries, with the Tang dynasty in power, symbols began to be enclosed inside Buddhistic statues in China. And the custom, which was at first confined to the great idols in the great temples, gradually spread to the lesser statues. The finding a reel of cotton, a skein of silk, a small round mirror, and a Buddhist writing in Chinese, inside a statue in a temple at Hue, at first puzzled the learned, but in this custom lies an explanation ready to hand. These objects, according to an ancient Chinese work, are symbols of the flesh, nerves and desires, which must complete the incarnation of the divinity therein represented. The mirror is the symbol of vision or sight. In it are reflected the most secret thoughts and deeds of men.

In the sixth century two reformers appeared on the scene, Kong-tse or Confucius, and Tao-tse, the one a moralist, the other a speculative philosopher. Tao-tse was first in the field, but the two were contemporaries. Forthwith there sprang up two new systems of religion, Confucianism and Taoism. Add to this that every Chinaman—excepting learned sages, unlearned bonzes, or priests, and teachers—is free to believe what he pleases, and a fair idea is obtained of the medley of Chinese religions. The Chinaman selects as his god that divine being whom he thinks will best serve his purpose. Even the learned, who are bound by official ties to Confucianism, have no scruple in invoking the superhuman beings of other cults.[5] Confucian-

4 Vigouroux, l.c., p. 288. Also Legge, Faber, Kappel, and others. Compare also Saussaye, p. 241.

5 Harlez, *Controv.*, 1887, p. 322.

ism bears the stamp of Buddhist influence—Buddhism blended with Taoism; indeed, this last is Buddhism in disguise.

The original name of Kong-tse (not Kong-fu-tse), the teacher of the race of Kong, was Tschung-ni. He lived between the years 551 and 478 B.C. It was an age of political excitement, and Confucius' life was in many ways troubled and uneasy. This fitted him to be a moral preacher, and he gave utterance to his pessimistic views. He died inconsolable and in despair. In him pride turned the scale against humility. He was puffed up by his wisdom, the attainment of which he had made the goal of his ambition. The standard by which he judged others was their attitude towards himself. As a reformer, he cared less for novelty than for collecting and preserving what was old. His immediate purpose was to be a literary man. Only in this capacity did he build up a moral system, the cardinal points of which were the fixed order of heaven and the example of the wise men of old. He took part in religious rites, but his religious position is doubtful. He regarded Shang-ti, whose name he seldom mentions except in quotations, as the only god; but after all his god is only something abstract and impersonal. All things are the result of natural forces. Man returns to nature, and vanishes. Worship of ancestors, which has more reference to the past than to the future, or next life, is a means of representing and inculcating the ideal of the wise man.

It is sometimes denied that the moral system of Confucius was based on the greatest happiness principle, and took into account only the present life. It is nevertheless true, in the main, the distinction between the ideal of the masses and of the wise notwithstanding; in spite, too, of the fact that success is not held up as the grand motive of action. "The golden rule of reciprocity: Do to others as you would be done by,"[6] has no deep moral basis, unless taken in conjunction with other rules in the Sermon on the Mount, which point to rewards in a future life. It corresponds to the second rule of Confucius:

6 Saussaye p. 249.

Virtue lies in the mean. That the balance of our lives in public and private and in the state has one scale of reason to poise another of sensuality is due to the glorious principle of order, heaven's first law,—a principle that is dragged in by the heels into a barren code of morality. The religious life is merged in the state. The emperor, who is the son of heaven and the lord of the central kingdom, is the organ of the world-reason; priests are his officials, acts of worship are state acts, religious feasts are state feasts. Much as it is to be desired that princes should be wise and loving fathers to their people, and strive to make them virtuous and happy as in times past, yet, after all, man is but a limb of the state, and religion a branch of state-craft. Considering all these things, it is not surprising to find that this reformer, who placed religion and wisdom at once under the heel and under the wing of the state, has risen to such a high place in the esteem of posterity.

Laotse, the elder of the two wise men, is said to have been born in 604, and to have become acquainted with Kong-tse in the city of the Tscheu. Of his personal history little is known; for he was of a speculative cast of thought, and, unlike Kong-tse, had no ambition to attract the masses. His teaching is embodied in the Tao-te-King, but the explanation thereof is a veritable Chinese puzzle. Tao (Reason, way) is the first principle, the perfect, incomprehensible being who existed before heaven and earth came into being. He has no body; he is omnipresent but invisible, the first cause of all things, and the motive of moral action; he protects the good and holds out a saving hand to sinners. He created Shang-ti, the god of heaven or the sun. Everything is deified. In fact, the whole system is an idolatrous Pantheism, which in many points bears a resemblance to Brahmanism, although it is not probable that Taoism was directly influenced thereby. So Tao's morality like Tao himself is chiefly negative. Virtue consists in doing nothing. Hence his maxims have a different meaning from those in the Gospel, where they are taken in the fullest sense of

the words; e.g.: wordly gain is in the end loss; mercy is the secret of strength; return good for evil.[7] The very fact that this book of virtue (Te=virtue) leaves us in a flaky darkness concerning the preliminaries of religion and immortality, shows how hollow the maxims are.

Philosophers are less severe than religious historians in their judgments on the barren nature of Taoism.[8] Of all the writings outside the Old and New Testaments, they say, the Tao-te-King embodies the best results of religious enquiry. God, whose name is unspeakable, and who transcends all finite categories, is known immediately by intution, not by a reflex process. He is a conscious spirit and holy will, without, however, the limitations to which a finite spirit and will is subject. His activity knows no bounds. He is pure goodness, grace, mercy and longanimity. As he is the full and perfect cause of the world in its origin, continuance and end, so he preserves and governs the world he created, and, like a father, provides for the wants of his creatures. His representative on earth is Shang-ti, who acts as the foster-parent to this world. Some go so far as pretend to have discovered three more divine persons really distinct. Older missionaries had put a trinitarian construction on the first principle which is represented as colourless (*I*), soundless (*Hi*), and incorporeal (*Wei*). The first principle is said to be *super-ens* or *non-ens*, nameless and original both in regard to other divine principles and to the world. "The 'nameless is the first cause of heaven and earth; the named is "the mother of all things." "Both have the same origin and "different names." In other words: both have the same nature, but are different persons. The second principle is said to be the completion and plenitude of the first; the form of the formless, the image of the imageless, whose name is the name and manifestation of the *super-ens* and nameless, the creator of the world, first father and lord, the beginning of the beginning.

7 Saussaye, p. 249.

8 Schell, *Die Tao-Lehre des Lao-tse. Philos. Jahrbuch*, 1837, L. p. 403.

The third principle is the spirit who, abiding in God, is poured forth abroad. He is immortal and is called the deep female element, the gate of the deep female, the root of heaven and earth. These three powers are represented to be a real divine triad, and not mere cosmic principles; for, it is urged, that it is expressly declared to be a question of a divine process of life culminating in a trinity, which is the supernatural cause of creation. "Tao begets One; One begets Two; Two begets "Three; Three produces all things." In this way, it is contended, the theology of the Chinese theosophist comes within an ace of the revealed doctrine of the Trinity.

Whence had Lao-tse his wisdom? Like other founders of religions in ancient times, he appeals to a revelation from God. Some profess to have found indications of the divine name, Jahve, in his writings.[9] Owing to the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities, it is argued, the Israelites were so dispersed that it is very probable that they came in contact with the Chinese. Anyhow, the improbability of such contact having taken place in ancient times seems to become less and less in the light of the progressive science of ethnography. Are not the voyages of Solomon,* and the name Sinim† an evidence of Jewish influence? Have not, too, the Chinese a tradition that intellectual influences passed into their country from the far West? Laotse himself is said to appeal often to an ancient book which probably taught him the meaning of the name Jahve.

This hypothesis has been repeatedly broached, but cannot historically be either proved or disproved. The name Sinim, even if it is one and the same with China, would establish nothing beyond the fact of some external contact and relation between Israel and China. Later traditions cannot be taken as

9 Schell, l.c., p. 425. Against: M. Müller. *Einleitung in die Relig. Wiss.* 1874. p. 300. With regard to Isaias xlix. 12, see Delitzsch and Knabenbauer in their commentaries on that passage. Osorius, a Lapide and others also had China in view. So likewise Gesenius in comparing the Greek text of the Septuaginto with the Latin of the Vulgate.

* III Kings ix. 26.

† Is. xlix. 12.

a sufficient proof for such an early connection between the two peoples. What shred or tittle of evidence is there that Laotse was conversant with Hebrew works? Of course he quotes ancient books. But the books that he and Confucius appealed to were Chinese works, for they both raised their own superstructure on the ancient Chinese religion. The name Jahve itself could never have evoked his trinitarian teaching, for the all-sufficient reason that even among the Jews the doctrine of the Trinity was never distinctly included in it. How then, it will be asked, do you explain his teaching? Unless this alleged trinity differs substantially from the pantheistic triads of the Brahmans, no explanation is necessary. But this is not so. Lao-tse's idea of God lacks the complete notion of personality. Three distinct persons are still further from his thoughts. The cosmic Pantheism of his doctrine, so far from being contradicted, follows as a necessary consequence of Lao-tse's origin or procession from nothing (*non-ens*). Even Hegel might teach a trinity after this fashion. Thus it is possible to steer a middle course between having recourse to the Old Testament, and offering no explanation at all. The whole drift of the Indian and Oriental mind forbids us to attribute such a sublime conception to Taoism. To derive it from the Old Testament, or to put it on a level with the prologue of S. John's Gospel, would prove full of danger for the latter: not as if these books were in any way dependent on Chinese theosophy, but it would then be impossible to show clearly that this great Christian mystery could only be known from revelation.

The same must be said in regard to the *Messianic idea*, the ideal of the wise man, which forcibly recalls Plato's ideal. Having painted wisdom in fair colours, Lao-tse clothes his ideal with personal existence in the holy man, who surpasses all other creatures in holiness and virtue. In this description, it is said, we see the outlines of the picture of the servant of God pourtrayed by Isaias.* He is gentle, overflowing with

* Isaias, XI, 10; L. 4 LXI

self-sacrifice, meek, and patient. Without respect of persons, and raised above human pettiness and prejudices, he is the ideal king, and image of Tao. He searches men's hearts, and is ever ready to help his creatures. In the sight of the Most High he bears on his shoulders the iniquity of all the people. Had, then, Lao-Tse read Isaias? Or is this description a remnant of that primitive tradition to which he so frequently appeals? The former seems to me quite improbable; in fact, as improbable as that Plato should have taken his ideal man from Holy Scripture. Traces of primitive revelation there unquestionably are; but I do not believe that they ever gave rise, even among the Jews, to such a fully developed notion of the Messias. The great difference between the heathen idea of a Messias and that set forth in the Old Testatament lies in the expectation that an ideal man with a concrete personality would be sent by God. The mystical conception of an ideal man, according to the promptings of the human heart, bears testimony indeed to the high moral character of the theosophist and poet, but is insufficient to prove the existence of a belief in a real Messias to come.

In the first century, as we have already observed, Buddhism had penetrated into China, and was daily gaining ground. On many points it was at one with Taoism, which, shorn of its speculative character, became the popular religion, while Confucianism remained the official state religion. "The worship "of Heaven is still the Imperial worship; worship of ancestors "is still the groundwork of the popular religion; Confucian books are still the classics of China."[10] For the rest, the people care little for dogma. Neither the ancient philosopher Lao-Tse nor his wonder-working school, nor Buddhistic saints, nor the prince of wisdom and his disciples, nor the supreme lord worshipped in past ages, however numerous the temples dedicated to them, are, as a rule, the gods of the multitude. Their Olympus is crowded with genii, good and bad, with exorcists, whose services are greatly prized, and who are but deified men.

10 Saussaye, p. 261.

It is to these that they at all times have recourse. The whole face of the country is studded with erections in their honour.[11] In the corners of streets, in gardens and corn-fields, on the mountain-top, in groves, in the niches of the walls of houses, in a word, everywhere are to be seen shrines sacred to men who had been deified by priest or emperor. They were gods without ceasing to be men. They are more like Christian or Jewish saints than heathen gods. Thus, honour is paid to whom honour is due, belief in immortality is kept alive, and the living commune with the dead. Example is contagious, and new shrines are ever springing up.

The learned, among them as has been already remarked, preserve an attitude of stolid indifference; they shut their eyes, and comfort themselves, as if the ancient religion were still in the land and everywhere in the ascendent. One of them, being questioned on this point, as if to guard himself against the charge of superstition and fear, made answer: "there are shrines "everywhere; but who knows anything about them? or who "looks into them"? Then again, there are buildings consecrated to the personifications of diseases that are held in most abhorrence: pestilence, asthma, small-pox, nervous and ophthalmic diseases, and the like; or, again, honour is paid to all the diseases collectively in the person of a "being, whose every part of the body—there are ten parts—is diseased or faulty." All this is a branch and parcel of the magic which is a dominant element in Taoism and Confucianism. In the former it appears mostly under the form of life-elixir, in the latter of geomancy (Feng-shui), which is largely brought into play as an aid to the selection of suitable localities. In the prohibitions to shed blood or to injure animal life we catch a glimpse of Buddhism. The statues set up in the temples to such animals as the lion, tiger, serpent, fox, ferret, hare and rat, point to the same influence. An image of the "immortal" fox, "the guardian of "law, and the inspirer of good deeds," will find a place between

11 Harlez, *Controverse*, 1887, p. 322. Saussaye, p. 436.

the statues of Buddha. Everything—faith, religion, and prayer—smacks of utilitarianism. No god, whatever phase of thought he represents, is, as far as worship goes, to be left in the cold, or offended. Elements, animals, diseases; Confucius, Lao-tse, Buddha,—all dwell together in heavenly harmony. Ancestor-worship, founded on filial love and sprung from the simple teaching of Confucius, is the one common link; nay, it may be said to be the only religion of China. Chinese religion derives its morality from Confucianism, its doctrine that the soul is but a purer form of matter from Taoism, and its metaphysics from Buddhism.[12] Thus the Chinese cannot be simply described as Buddhists. Their asceticism is, indeed, Buddhistic in origin, but it is most mechanical, especially in prayer,—the prayers being passed through "prayer-mills," which are worked by hand, wind or water. On Buddhistic pyramids there are scrolls of Thibetan prayer-formulæ.[13]

From all this it is evident that the modern Chinese religion has almost wholly erased all traces of a primitive revelation. Both Christian and rationalistic writers have appraised it at too high a figure; the latter, Voltaire for instance, to show that revelation was unnecessary, the former to prove the existence of a primitive revelation. Decline and decay is written on its every feature, more especially in Thibet, where the great Lama is adored as god. Christian missionaries have very uphill work, and make but slight progress. Their task is indeed doubly difficult because the Chinese religion is a state religion, which, by means of ancestor-worship, has caught every department of family and civil life in its snare. Enthusiastic veneration for the writings of the wise men of old is the chief cause that prevents the Chinese, and indeed all peoples with ancient documentary religions, from entering the right path.[14] Religious records, esteemed for thousands of years as a sacred treasure,

12 *Revue de l'hist. des religions* 1880, p. 355.
13 *Kathol. Missionen*, Freiburg, 1882, p. 40, 1887, p. 55.
14 Harlez, *Controverse* 1885, p. 530.

combined with traditional observances, have bred a conservatism in religion in keeping with the character and habits of the people, which presents an almost insurmountable difficulty; for to abandon records and observances would tear asunder social and religious ties, and constitute a breach with history and the entire past.

---

§ 2.—The Japanese.

The Japanese are a cross between Mongol and Malay, and their religion is as mixed as their race. The recent discovery of Sanscrit works in Japan reveals the finger of India.[15] In 288 A.D., Confucianism crossed from China to Japan, and allied itself to the popular religion. In contradistinction to Buddhism, which began to gain ground in 552 A.D., it is called Shin-tao ("The way" or "teaching of the gods") in Chinese, and Kami-no-mitsi in Japanese.* It teaches that the islands of the Japanese Empire, the whole world, and the sun and moon were, in the course of ages, created by spirits. Thus there are seven gods of heaven and five of earth. Here is already a tincture of Buddhism. At the same time we find the ancestor-worship of Confucius with its corresponding belief in immortality, which Buddhism did its best to stifle. Men are the offspring of the sun and moon, the imperial house being descended from the sun. The Mikado is Tensi or son of heaven, and is held so sacred that he is addressed as Dairi or Imperial Palace. Sacrifices, prayers, purifications, feasts, processions and banquets go to make up Japanese worship. In the fore-court of the temple the priests keep alive a pure fire. There are many pilgrimages to the sacred shrine Ise. Latterly, especially since 1874, the Shintao religion (Sintoism) has received special official protection against Buddhist encroachments. An anti-Christian Japanese of the present day believes that all the

15 Saussaye p. 399.
* Kami signifies a guardian spirit.

relations of life are regulated by the *Ko* and *Kin* of Confucius. The Ko treats of the relations of men to one another, and prescribes degrees of love or friendship varying according to the degrees of kindred. The Kin prescribes the manner and method of showing respect and submission to authority. Obedience to this two-fold teaching, thinks the Japanese, will ensure happiness at home and peace with the world at large.[16] Obedience to parents, masters, and those in authority is a duty that takes precedence of all others, for it is the hinge on which the safety of the state turns. Hence he opposes Christianity tooth and nail, and looks forward to the day when Confucianism shall triumph over all other religions, as he conceives that the world will thrive and flourish best under its sway.* The ordinances of Confucius are supreme. To other matters the Japanese are almost indifferent. This confident tone of superiority only marks a reaction against the introduction of Western civilization which would necessarily bring Christianity in its train. *A propos* of the threefold obedience that women owe to their parents, their husbands and their children, it may be observed

16 *Revue*, p. 389 seq. On the question of women see *Allgem. Zeitg.* 1887. No. 257.

* Very recently a great change seems to have come over Japan in this respect. The relentless opposition of the State to the introduction of Christianity has ceased, and a door is open to the Gospel and to Western influence. "The year 1890 was marked by four great events in the history of the Catholic Church in the Japanese Empire. The first was the new Constitution issued by the MIKADO's government "in the month of February, of which Art. 27 guarantees for the first time full "religious freedom to all Japanese subjects. The second was the first Synod of "the united Vicars Apostolic of Japan and Corea, inaugurated on March 3, at "Nagasaki, the 'City of Martyrs,' and in which their Lordships issued a joint "pastoral letter narrating the extraordinary growth of their Church during the last "30 years. The third event, most important of all, was the erection of the "Japanese hierarchy by LEO XIII., with the metropolitan see of Tokio, and the "three suffragan sees of Nagasaki, Kioto, and Sendai, having spiritual charge of "40,000 Catholics in 499 mission stations. Lastly, on May 1st, took place the "blessing of the beautiful new metropolitan Cathedral of ST. FRANCIS XAVIER at "Kioto,—lighted by the way with the electric light. At this splendid demon-"stration, not only three Catholic Bishops and innumerable of the faithful, but also "the Governor General of Kioto, and his wife, the Head of the Police, the two "Mayors, and numerous officials took part. The pagan ladies had even presented "the carpet for the church! Bishop MIDON in his eloquent sermon, reminded his "hearers that 20 years ago not a single neophyte was to be found in the city and "the priests were all in hiding; and now he publicly prayed for God's blessing on "'the august person of His Majesty the MIKADO and the officials of this beautiful "'land."—*Illustrated Catholic Missions*, Jan., 1891. Tr.

that the question as to the position of woman has lately been raised. Serious efforts are made to obtain for her the same position as is assigned by Europeans to women in the family circle and in society. This tendency is symbolized and expressed by the adoption of European dress.

---

§ 3. The Egyptians.

The Egyptians furnish a transition from the Hamites to the Semites. Their position in the history of religion and language is unique. Generally they are considered Hamites; but Egyptologists are even now hotly disputing whether the Egyptian language is closely akin or wholly foreign to the Semitic. The latest suggestion is distinctly in favour of an affinity between the Semitic and African languages; an affinity which would mean more than that the Hamitic had borrowed from the Semitic. Nay some go so far as to suppose that Africa was the home of the Semites.[17] Anthropologists also profess to see so many points of resemblance between Semites and North Africans, Caffres included, that they feel justified in setting up a distinct African-Arabic race.[18] Thus Egyptian culture is, in some way, at least, linked to Semitic. It is no longer quite correct to consider the old land of the Nile as an entirely independent focus of intellectual activity in religion and language, as if the elements of both reached back far beyond the age of full-blown Semitism and Aryanism.[19] Still we must beware of drawing the lines of contact too sharply. Of course Egyptians have decided peculiarities of their own, physical as well as religious. In his carriage and mode of life the ancient Egyptian has nothing in common with the Caucasian; his religion is a mixture of the loftiest views with very gross elements which are quite foreign to the Semitic

17 Nöldeke, *Die Semitischen Sprachen*, Berlin 1887.

18 See Saussaye p. 175, 179.

19 Max Müller, *Religionswiss.* p. 148.

and Aryan religions.[20] On the other hand, Egyptian literature is something quite unique. It is enshrined in texts on papyrus and in monumental inscriptions. The monumental inscriptions are in hieroglyphics. Of the papyrus texts the most ancient are written in hieratic, the most recent in demotic characters. Owing to the dryness of the climate the scrolls of papyrus, some of which go back to the year 3000, have been preserved unhurt for thousands of years. But amid all the copious Egyptian literature, there are no canonical books. Documents there are in abundance, such as the famous Book of the Dead, which, while they give a pleasing insight into Egyptian religion and morality, have no title to be considered official. Clement of Alexandria says that the wisdom of the Egyptians was enshrined in forty-two hermetic books, but we have no means of judging in what relation these stood to the sacred books in use.

Herodotus says that the Egyptians were, beyond the rest of men, an exceedingly god-fearing people. To some, the verdict of the Father of History seems proven by history and archæology; while others affirm that his statement has poisoned the wells of enquiry. For it is exceedingly hard to determine the character of Egyptian religion. The early writings and inscriptions are at variance with the later. The common fundamental thoughts, if such exist, can only be reached with the greatest difficulty after piercing through the thick mists of local differences. The sharp distinction between exoteric and esoteric doctrine, though recently denied again, is dangerously near mistaking the shell for the kernel. The chequered political history of the country has disturbed the religious equilibrium again and again. An interval of perhaps 5,000 years separates the last stones at Esneh, engraved under Philip the Arabian, from the first tomb at Memphis, which is that of a king belonging to the third of the thirty-one dynasties that are generally counted up to the time of Alexander the Great. During these 5,000 years, to say nothing of the Shepherd

20 *Revue*, 1886 (xiv.) p. 27.

Invasion, the Ethiopian and Assyrian dominion, the Persian and Greek contest, and a thousand political revolutions, the fragile vessel of Egypt's intellectual and moral life has embarked on many an uncertain voyage.[21] Is it then surprising that the views of Egyptologists should shift with the wind? At one time Maspero advocated monotheism as the original religion of Egypt; now he holds it to have been polytheistic. But polytheism, he thinks, gave way to monotheism as early as the fourth dynasty. For the change in his opinions he assigns a reason that is not too paltry to merit consideration. "Men," he says, "are always led away by some sort of pre-"conceived idea. Some, hoping to find the stamp of divine "unity on everything, have searched every nook and cranny "for monotheistic ideas, and, by ingeniously shelving all "rebutting evidence, have proved to their own satisfaction "that the Egyptian religion was monotheistic. Others, bewil-"dered by the multiplicity of divine forms, which cross and "re-cross one another till they are lost in a maze, have thought "that the different doctrines register so many shades of pan-"theism. To one it seems self-evident that the monuments "preach the crudest polytheism. To another everything "glistens with the sun and sun-worship. Others see in the gods "only concrete representations of abstruse metaphysical ideas. "To me all seem both right and wrong; right in one point, "wrong in many." Here are some of the principal representatives of the various opinions concerning the original religion of the Egyptians. Monotheism is advocated by de Rongé, Lauth, and Pierret; henotheism by Le Page Renouf; pantheism by Brugsch; sun-worship by Lepsius; nature-worship by Lieblun; animism by Tiele; mixed ideas by Pietschmann, Wiedeman, Meyer, and Maspero.

In the midst of such divers opinions, who shall decide? Nevertheless, when a majority of the most reliable Egyptologists

21 Maspero, *Revue*, 1880, p. 122. *Histoire ancienne des peuples d'Orient*, 4. éd. Paris, 1886. Compare, *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theol.* 1887, p. 182. See also Saussaye, p. 265 and 272 seq.

assure us that the ancient Egyptian faith plainly taught the unity of God, the immortality of the soul, and the creation of the world, it is right to take their word.[23] The Egyptian religion, while apparently polytheistic, is in reality monotheistic. Herein lies its peculiarity. When Maspero is forced to concede that monotheism appeared early on the scene, it is forthwith probable that monotheism is its groundwork. The most ancient documents that have come down to us, those, that is, from the third and fourth dynasties, speak among others, of *the* God, the one and only God. This name and idea may, indeed, have been applied sometimes to the local deities, but anyhow it is remarkable that, in the oldest documents, the monotheistic idea should be to the fore, side by side with its polytheistic form and expression. This idea, though corrupted by supervening naturalism, survived in the hymns and funeral service, even when polytheism arising from the amalgamation of local deities, was on the increase. In Memphis was worshipped Ptah or Patah, the designer, who is the first being and has created all things. In Amu, (called in Greek Heliopolis, and in the Bible On) was worshipped Ra. Amon was worshipped in the royal temple of Karnac, at Thebes, and Osiris in Abydos or Thinis. But Amon, who according to Plutarch is the first being and all things, Ra, the sun-god, and Ptah are in an ancient document set down as one god. As the invsible one he is called Amon (the hidden Deity); as eternity and infinity his name is Ptah; as the builder of cities his name is Ra. Hence it came to pass that, when Upper Egypt gained the supremacy, Amon-Ra was the supreme god; the union of names signifying that Upper and Lower Egypt were united. Even if this story, as Maspero contends, had been invented by the Theban priests to confer supremacy on their god Amon, it would still go to show that the several local deities were conceived as one. The original meaning of the name Osiris, a personification of Amon, on

[23] See Vigouroux, III. 16 seq; Pesch, p. 116; Fischer, p. 268; Pierret, *Essai sur la Mythologie*, Paris 1879. Compare *Revue*, 1880, p. 119 seq; Saussaye, p. 274.

whose name all subsequent development of Egyptian religion hangs, and who was universally worshipped, is likewise that of supreme god. He is the "imperishable god," benevolent, rich in mercy, hidden, alone, wonderful; he embraces all, and has conceived all that is; he created heaven and earth, the waters and the mountains; he designed all being and created himself.[23] In other words, he is the supreme being under another name; for which reason the god-head is said to be "rich in names." According to Jamblich and a papyrus record the priests at Annu held the esoteric doctrine that there is one only god, who is divided into three persons: Amun, Ptah and Osiris, according to Jamblich; Amun, Ra and Ptah, says the record. Some have thought that these were traces of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. But the Egyptian religion seems to be fond of Triads,[24] which usually appear as Father, Mother, and Son: Osiris, Isis, Horus; Set, Nibithit, Anupu; Amon, Mut, Khons.

The different persons do not represent different attributes, as men have so readily believed, but the various offices and functions of the one supreme hidden god (Nuter) who, under each form, preserves his identity and his attributes in their entirety. The two things are by no means identical. Although the people may have worshipped every form for its own sake, without due regard to the theoretical bearing of one on the other, it helps us to explain and understand how monotheism gradually merged into polytheism. The triads and enneads sprang from the several ways of conceiving Horus, Ra and Osiris. And withal the triads were artificial in the extreme: often, indeed, a mere amalgam of heterogeneous myths. But it is precisely their artificial combination that discloses how forcibly and irresistibly the divine unity made itself felt, and held its ground against all obstacles.[25] The one supreme God was everywhere invested with a local colouring, and worshipped under a local name.

23 Kaiser, *Ueber die Theol. Lehre der alten Ægypter. Kath.* 1882. ii. p. 600. Vigouroux, iii. 15 seq.

24 Fritz, p. 60. Vigouroux, iii, 17.

25 Lefébure, *Revue* 1886 (XIV.) p. 35.

It is but natural in the hour of fervent worship to increase and intensify the several perfections of the Godhead. Hence the natural tendency to polytheism. "This tendency may still be seen in deified elements of nature—the highest theological abstractions of the royal pyramids." Above triads and enneads stands one supreme God. But being creator of the other gods who personify different parts of the world, he could not, collectively considered, be wholly distinct from the world. Thus Egyptian monotheism, though clad in a polytheistic dress, is also stamped with pantheistic features. Some even pretend to see Hegelian speculation at work in Hermopolis; add, they say, Nun or moisture, that is matter, to Heh or time, that is motion, and the sum total is Being. To Keku or darkness that is the void, add Nen or rest, that is inaction, and Nothing is the result. "This is evidently the high watermark of Egyptian speculation." The date of this speculation is still uncertain. Anyhow, there was no difference between the cosmogony and the theogony. Water (Nun) was assumed as the first principle that begot Light (Ra.) In the temple of Sais is the inscription: ἐγώ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονός, ὂν καὶ ἐσόμενον, the pantheistic tint of which may be perceived by reading it in the light of Exodus III. 14.

Deification of nature, in the shape of Sabæism, was the portal through which polytheism first entered. Sabæism again lost itself in mythology. Semites and Phœnicians introduced Typhon into the Osiris myth as the representative of the evil principle. Typhon is the same as the Semitic god Set, and he, again, is identical with Nubti. To Typhon belong the salt seas, and all things nauseous, compound, and impure; for which reason the Egyptians were for ever debarred from becoming a sea-faring people.[26] The Greeks give a further impetus to new religious development. Symbols were themselves made into gods. The sun, the most ancient symbol,[27]

26 Pierret, l.c., p. 120. Ebers-Guthe, *Palestina*, II., 59.
27 Kayser, l.c., p. 623.

now figured as Ra, the sun-god. Tun became the setting sun, and Horus the mid-day sun, while the sun hidden at night was represented as Osiris, and so forth. The converse theory which asserts that the human mind gradually climbed up the steep ascent from things sensible to things eternal, and thus met the sun as the first object of worship, has hardly any probability on its side, even if it be granted that the sun was at a very early period the symbol and the seat of the Godhead. If Egyptians, four thousand years ago, had delved in the mine of speculation to a depth that we have not yet been able to fathom,[28] this only proves that the religion of the Egyptians is very old, and that we must be on our guard against drawing hasty conclusions. Neither symbolism, nor philosophic nor evolutionary hypotheses can adequately explain the development of the Egyptian religion, for it precedes all history; history does but reveal its various modifications. "The Egyptians, more "than any other people, have retained and allowed free "development to every branch that a religious system can "tolerate: animism, fetichism, polytheism, and monotheism. "But of these only the last two—especially the last—are well "known to us."[29] As the Egyptian religion appears on the horizon perfectly formed, we can know nothing about the time and manner of its formation. Its origin is buried in as deep obscurity as the sources of the Nile. Twice the Semites vainly rose up in arms against mythological polytheism. About the year 2,000 Hyksos Pharaoh Apopi strove to get Set and Amon-Ra recognised as the only gods. Five hundred years later Khunaten, the 4th Amenhotep of the 18th dynasty, whose mother was Thi, a Semite, strove to oust Amon in favour of Aten-Ra. But these attempts were doomed to failure.

In early times *sexual dualism* had made a cleavage in the divine unity. Neith, Nut, Pacht and Hathor appear as female deities. Again, in the combined worship of Osiris-Isis, which represents

28 Fritz, p. 59.

29 Lefèbure, l.c. p. 46 seq. Saussaye, p. 294 seq.

the original being, and the indwelling force in the four elements, this dualism assumed a naturalistic and pantheistic colour, representing space and light as against storm and darkness. The myth of Osiris, which afterwards became general, makes Osiris, in conjunction with his sister and spouse Isis, the sun-god and the god of the Nile. They have their counterpart in the Babylonian Bel and Baaltis. Osiris is slain by his brother and foe Set-Typhon. Set-Typhon is slain by Horus, son of Osiris, but nevertheless continues to live, while Osiris survives in Horus, and at the same time is invested with sovereignty over the realms of the dead. In the worship of Serapis, Osiris and Apis (=Serapis) are the chief figures. Thot and Horus, and more particularly Osiris and Isis, survive above all others, as gods of the dead. Osiris' battle with Typhon recalls the fall, while the survival of the latter reminds us of original sin. The serpent also appears as the tempter.[30] Here, then, we have a clue to the three great classes of Egyptian gods: gods of the dead, gods of the elements, and sun-gods. Sokari, Osiris and Isis, and perhaps also the younger Horus, Anubis, Nephthys, are gods of the dead; Siv (earth), Nut (heaven), Nu (the first water), Hapi, and probably Sook (the Nile), Set-Typhon, Haroiri (Hor the elder), Phtah, and others are gods of the elements; while the sun gods are represented by Ra, Shu, Onhuri, Amon, and others.[31]

But perhaps the most remarkable and at the same time the most startling feature in Egyptian religion is its animal-worship, which has been in vogue from the earliest times, even from the first dynasty.[32] Whether, as is the case with savages, it has reference to the souls of the dead, or, as the Egyptian priests insist, it is symbolical of the worship of the gods, is still an open question. Originally, indeed, animals symbolised the divinity, as for instance Apis (the bull) and the cat. The former was

30 Kayser, p. 626.

31 Maspero, *Revue*, 1880, p. 125.

32 Compare Herodotus, ii, 65-76; iii, 28. Diodor. Sic. i, 83-90. Strabo, xvii, 38-40; Plutarch, *de Is. et Os.* 71-77; Saussaye, p. 280, seq.

worshipped and embalmed at Memphis, the latter at Bubastis. But like other symbols, e.g., the scarabæus (beetle), ibis, boar, sparrow-hawk, serpent and others, they eventually became gods, and were put side by side with gods. As early as the age of the Ptolemies, the symbols rank as divine, although the priests, who never lost sight of the divine unity, did not worship them as such. Of course in the hieroglyphics animals represent ideas. Several, like the crocodile and hippopotamus, in some countries were adored and in others were loathed. Assuredly this worship is tinged with fetichism but the only question claiming investigation is: In what relation did it stand to the old religion? Herodotus says that all the Africans were sorcerers or fetich-worshippers. Owing to the prevalence of magic it is thought that the Egyptians were included in this verdict. Anyhow, the development of the Egyptian religion cannot be traced from this point, although the popular religion preceded its philosophic exposition.

Worship and morality are the most salient features of the many-sided religion of the Egyptians. From the beginning it was a popular religion, and in great measure remained such. The images of the gods were set up in stately temples. The sacrifices and the service of the temple were in the hands of a numerous priesthood who had, indeed, received special consecration, but were not an exclusive caste. The priests were also the learned men, and had charge of education. The monthly and annual festivals were celebrated with processions, music, and dancing. To the king, as the representative of god, religious honours were paid.

The Egyptians, as is well known, treated the dead and the monuments of the dead with the greatest care. The pyramids erected at Memphis during the fourth and fifth dynasties still bear testimony to this fact. Our museums abound in mummies and coffins, covered with inscriptions. Every fresh discovery goes to confirm the saying of Diodorus that the houses of the living are but lodgings, whereas the sepulchres of the dead are

everlasting mansions. It also bears out the testimony of Herodotus, as to Egyptian belief in the immortality of the soul. They were, he thought, the first to teach it. No people allowed wider scope to the idea of immortality in connection with certain metamorphoses in the next life. This should not, however, be confused with the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, which Herodotus ascribes to the Egyptians. Immortality, as conceived by them, implied in the first place a kind of continuance of the present life; an indispensable condition of life in the next world being the careful preservation of the dead body. In the meanwhile the soul has a two-fold existence. It hovers about the mummy as Ka or Copy, but dwells spiritually in other spheres as Ba, or spiritual soul. The resurrection does not exclude the transformation of the body. To try and account for belief in the resurrection of the dead by the alternations of days, months and years, or by the rise and fall of the Nile, is but to furnish an analogy, which might have presented itself to other nations as well, and which fails to clear up the chief point in debate. For the experience, that acts as a guide in natural phenomena, is wholly absent as regards immortality and the resurrection. To pray and offer sacrifice for the dead was a sacred duty, to which children were especially bounden. Hence a son was looked upon as a great blessing. In the lower world (Ament), the soul is subjected to a rigorous and searching scrutiny, which is set forth in detail in the Book of the Dead. It is incumbent on the soul to prove that it is free from the sins that lead to damnation.

As the foregoing would naturally lead us to expect, the Egyptians had a fairly complete moral code. Hope in a future life is its guiding star. It is characterized neither by gloomy fatalism nor optimistic levity; indeed, in many respects it resembles the Mosaic legislation. The rules of the papyrus scrolls leave the impression that they were purposely designed to bear witness to the primitive monotheism of the most ancient civilized peoples. "For the purer the ethical notions

of a people, the purer is their idea of God; the purer the human soul is, the greater its capacity for revelation."[33] Woman, it should be noted, occupied a high position. Fidelity and chastity were held in honour. Polygamy was not, indeed, forbidden, but neither was it universal, nor did it degenerate into a harem. Provision was made for the whole round of social duties. Not only the common crimes against person and property, but also lying and every other evil thing was forbidden. On the other hand mercy and charity, especially to widows and orphans, were highly esteemed. It would not be difficult to institute a comparison with the Decalogue. The oldest papyri and inscriptions lay special stress on the duties to God, man, and the state, and teach that parents and children, husbands and wives, should love one another. Drunkenness, lying and murder are forbidden. In the Book of the Dead, the soul is made to say to the judge: I have not wronged my fellow-man, nor told untruths, nor am I conscious of any sin; I have not laboured every day, nor have I committed murder or adultery, nor have I stolen in secret; and so forth.

The Egyptian religion, however, was gradually falling to pieces. Ever since the building of Alexandria, Greek ideas had been gaining the mastery, and Theodosius I. finally sealed its doom by destroying the temple of Serapis at Alexandria in 391 A.D.[34]

THE SEMITES.

An ancient but effete civilization is represented by the Semites, who were, in many respects, the rivals of the Egyptians. Owing to their relations with the chosen people they have always occupied a prominent place in revealed history. Assyrians, Babylonians, Canaanites and Phœnicians are classed

33 Naumann, *Wellhausens Methode*, Leipzig, 1886, p. 154 seq. Saussaye, p. 304. Vigouroux, ii., p. 501.

34 Saussaye, p. 313; Schultze, *Geschichte des Untergangs des griechisch-röm. Heid.*, p. 263 seq

as Semites. In the Table of Peoples the Phœnicians seem to be set down as Hamites, but their language is undoubtedly Semitic. And, after all, it is uncertain whether the Table of Peoples is a table of races or of individuals.

Were we called upon to point out the general characteristic of the Semitic religions, we should say that crude nature-worship, deification of natural forces and of such of the heavenly bodies as fall under observation (Astronomy and Astrology), together with spirit-worship as revealed in magic and divination (Chaldæan sorcerers) are their main features. This nature-worship serves as a stepping-stone to the religion of savages. Moreover, as history tells, the worship of God as Providence was common to all the Semites.[35] This of course implies that the Semites worshipped personal gods and were originally monotheists.[36] Renan would have it that monotheism is a characteristic of the Semitic race, which has asserted itself even in Mohammed. Deep reverence and submission to God's Almighty power is inseparably bound up with belief in a lord and master and divine providence. Dyu, the name for God common to the Aryans, had its counterpart in the Semitic El, which attested the religious and linguistic unity of the race. Thus Babel means Gate of God, (the Babylonian being Ilu, and the Accadian An.) But an early decline to materialistic polytheism set in. The different names given to God to designate his different attributes were gradually personified, and so distinguished from him. Among the Semites, as among other peoples, a further impetus was given to polytheism when the several local divinities were united in one Pantheon. For, in the beginning, every city showed special veneration to its own gods, without prejudice, however, to the divinities of other cities and nations.[37] The "twelve great Assyrian divinities," arranged according to the sexagesimal system are: Anu, Bel, Hea, Sin, Bin, Samas, Merodach, Ninip, Nergal,

35 Max Müller, *Religionswiss.* p. 140. Kuenen, *Volksreligion*, p. 24.

36 Pesch, p. 132. Vigouroux, i, p. 347. *Theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1887, p. 48.

37 Vigouroux, iv., p. 72.

Rusku, Beltis, Istar.[38] Several were grouped in triads: Anu, Bel, Hea; Sin, Samas, Raman (Bin). Belief in good and evil spirits was universal.

I. Assyrians and Babylonians.

Assyria and Babylon may be studied together, for they are divided neither in language nor in empire,[39] although they fought long and hard till Babylon was finally conquered under Sargon (722–705). Assur is an exclusively Assyrian name for God, but it is uncertain whether the god gave the name to the country or the country to the god. It is probable, however, that Assur (the good) is the second son of Sem, the deified progenitor of the Assyrians, from whom the country is named. The history of the two empires is usually divided into three periods: the old Babylonian, the Assyrian, and the New Babylonian. The first stretches as far back as about 3800 B.C.; thus its antiquity, though very remote, is not pre-Semitic. The second period opens in the 14th century, when the Assyrian power began to unfold its strength. The last and brief New Babylonian period dates from the conquest of Assyria by the Medes and Babylonians, about 606. The conqueror's name is Nabopolassor whose son was Nabuchodonosor, one of the most distinguished monarchs of the East. Under his successors the Empire fell into a rapid decline, until Cyrus, by the conquest of Babylon in 538, put an end to it. The cuneiform inscriptions on clay tablets, found in Ninive and its neighbourhood, belong to the seventh century B.C., but the originals, of which these are copies, are probably as old as the year 2000. The chief historical dates tally with those in the Old Testament, and with the *Fragmenta* of the Babylonian priest Berosus (300 A.D.), mentioned, according to the chronicles of Eusebius, by Alex-

38 Fischer, p. 182 seq.; Saussaye, p. 334 seq.

39 Pesch, p. 89; Vigouroux, i., p. 265.

ander Polyhistor and Josephus. Berosus is as great a name in Babylonian history as the Egyptian priest Manetho, quoted by Josephus,* is in Egyptian history. The difficulty of deciphering the triple cuneiform inscriptions in Persian, Median and Assyrian, and the uncertainty arising therefrom, render a complete view of the history and religion of these peoples at present impossible.

The polytheistic religion of Assyria and Babylon evidently presupposes the existence of an earlier religion in the land watered by the Tigris and Euphrates, the nature of which it is difficult to conceive or describe. At present it is an open question whether the Accadians or Sunnerians, who owned allegiance to the ancient Babylonian kings, and to whom the oldest cuneiform inscriptions refer, were of Semitic origin or not. Scholars are still investigating the language of the Chinese and the Cassian branches of the Turanian stock for affinities to the agglutinative language of the Babylonians. Their chief god is said to have been Uruki. Ur is the moon-god. The Ur of the Chaldæans (Mugheir) from which Abraham set out[40] points in the same direction. (Uruk = Erech). As far as we can judge, the Assyrians and Babylonians were originally light and fire worshippers. The supreme gods were Anu, Bel, and Asur. Historically Bel (lord) is the first king of Assyria; mythically he is the sun-god. Next in rank are Bellis (lady or mistress) the goddess of heaven, Semiramis, Aschera, Astarte, and Mylitta who is identical with the Iranian Anaites. Babylon, as the cuneiform inscriptions prove, was the cradle-land of Mylitta. There she is called Istar. The inscriptions graphically describe her expedition to hell for the water of life. She was the daughter of Hea (god of the waters of heaven and earth), or of Sin, the moon-god, and she was adored as the goddess of heaven (the planet Venus).[41] As, under several names, she represented the female principle, she was worshipped

40 Peech, p. 86. Vigouroux, i, 328. Saussaye, p. 321, seq.

41 Ebers-Guthe, ii, 64; Vigouroux, i, 219-227; iii, 111, seq. 237, iv, 27; Saussaye, p. 339.

* *Contra Apion.*

as the goddess of the fertile earth. She is endowed, moreover, not only with warlike courage, but also with glowing sensual love. This latter idea so overshadowed all others that, according to Herodotus, the worship of Mylitta was little else but a glorification of lust. As the sun both quickens and destroys, and as death is the antithesis of birth, so Bel or Baal or Moloch grew into a hostile god, to be appeased with human sacrifices; and Aschera, goddess of love, was transformed into the goddess of death. We have only to pursue this train of thought far enough to see that Chaldæan theology was coloured with pantheistic and naturalistic hues.

The most startling discoveries, however, made by Assyriology are those which relate to ancient history, and in particular to the history of creation. There is an unmistakable similarity between these accounts and that of the Bible. At first men were so overjoyed at the discovery, that they fastened on the many points of resemblance, and overlooked the discrepancies. Next a feeling of disappointment supervened, when it turned out that the flood of light thrown on this dark subject was not as great as had been anticipated. Nevertheless, they are a valuable confirmation of the Bible narrative. The two accounts, being independent one of the other, tell strongly for primitive revelation and a very ancient tradition. Berosus is a reliable witness to the Chaldæan account of creation. In substance it runs thus: In the beginning there was water (the woman Omoroca or Thaualt, i.e., the sea), darkness and chaos. By dividing these Bel made heaven and earth. Then Bel cut off his own head, and from his blood mixed with earth the gods fashioned man, in a condition bodily and spiritually perfect. Thus was laid the groundwork of civilization; for by creation, men were made participators in the Divine intelligence. Conjectures rather than traditions are afloat concerning paradise and the fall. On these points we still need more light. Thus the cosmogony is at the same time a theogony,—a process which the severe monotheism of the

Bible narrative excludes.

The account of the Flood we have already discussed.[42] Noe, if the inscription is correctly deciphered, figures under the name Hasisdra. At God's bidding he built for himself a ship. After the great flood he sent forth three birds in succession: a raven, a dove, and a swallow. Nor is the sacrifice of thanksgiving to the gods omitted. But then there is a battle of the gods, and the idea of punishment recedes into the background. In spite of the discrepancies in regard to the ship (ark), the length of time, the birds, and other points, the resemblance is more striking than between the two accounts of creation. Was one borrowed from the other? It is doubtful. No borrowing could have taken place during the captivity, for the Jews religiously cut themselves adrift from their oppressors; nor probably in the time of the kings. If Genesis really comes down from the time of Moses (on which more will be said hereafter) such an hypothesis is impossible.

---

2. The Peoples of Asia Minor.

With regard to the religion of the various peoples of Asia Minor, such as the Cilicians, Solymians, Carians, Lydians, Mysians, Cappadocians, who exercised some influence upon the Phrygians, Lycians, Armenians, and other non-Semitic peoples, it is noticeable that, at a later period, a monotheistic pantheism pushed itself to the front, as it did among the Syrians, Phœnicians, and Canaanites. Thanks to the Phœnicians, who always carried their gods with them on their travels, the Semitic religion has left its mark in Cyprus, Malta, Crete, Sardinia, Carthage, Marseilles, and many other foreign ports. It may be said generally that their gods are less sharply and hierarchically divided than those of the Babylonians. Worship develops a very pronounced astronomical side, and is characterized by

42 Vol. I. chapter xix.

voluptuousness, cruelty and bloodthirstiness. The non-Semitic name for the one god, Baal, brings out in strong relief its naturalistic character. Baal existed as the primitive substance, and evolved the visible world from himself; hence the material world is the only primitive substance in which the primitive Baal is manifested. Since, however, the material world is made up of many individual beings, each one of whom represents Baal, the Baal, who in the beginning was one, is now split up into many (Baalim.) The phenomena of the visible world are a theogony and history of the gods. The world is a representation of the godhead, which embraces alike the beggar and the king. All existence is linked together in one chain. Nature's forces and the godhead are one and the same thing.[43] Man also, in his social capacity, as people, town, or nation, is a manifestation of Baal. Thus god is identified with nationality. Still the monotheism and simpler form of the Semitic religion are revealed in the meaning of Baal. For, as a rule, each city had not a Pantheon, but only its own god and goddess. God's name varied with place and circumstance. Baal, as presiding over contracts, was Baal-Berith; as king, he was called Moloch, Milkom, Malkom; as the lord of flies his name was Baalzebub. On Mount Hermon he was Baal-Hermon; at Hazor, Baal-Hazor. But Baal was the father of the gods, and as such supreme Baal; the others were younger than he.

The moon was the complement of the sun, wherever the sun passed as a manifestation of Baal, and both were regarded as persons. By Baal and Baaltis (Astarte) are signified the everlasting beginning and end; birth and death; a coming forth from Baal and returning back to him.[44] From this sprang the licentious worship spoken of above. The supreme Baal represented the earth and the sun, the other Baals the sun's influence on the earth. "In the worship of the heavenly

43 Fritz. p. 210.

44 Scholz, *Jeremias*. Würzburg, 1880, p. 110, seq; Vigouroux, iii, 222, seq.

"bodies is written the blackest page in human history. It tells "how religious duty was misunderstood and distorted, and how "the noblest and holiest feelings were suppressed and sup-"planted by shameful mysteries and ghastly human sacrifices."[45] Phœnicians, Ammonites and Moabites held Moloch and Astarte in the highest honour. Moloch was the sun-god in his malevolent capacity—the fire-god who destroys and purifies, and is appeased by human sacrifice. Astarte was the goddess of the waning moon and infertility. Her priestesses were forbidden all sexual intercourse. Youths and men were castrated in her temples on purpose to serve her as eunuchs. There was also a kind of sun worship known as Melkart and Adonis, which, like the Egyptian religion, has reference to the annual revolution of the sun in the zodiac. Melkart and Adonis disappear in winter and reappear with renewed youth in the spring.

These religious ideas and customs were not lost on the Israelites who, however, far from admitting their correctness, most strenuously opposed them.[46] The Old Testament paints the creed and worship of the Canaanites in the darkest hues, and the order to exterminate the race, which could not of course be strictly executed to the letter, is thus easily understood. The sacred writers are ever reproving the Jews for holding intercourse with the Canaanites, and for taking part so often in naturalistic and sensual rites. The whole conception of heaven and earth; their symbolic localisation in certain cities and provinces; fear and sensuality, combined with bloodthirsty and licentious rites, acted more powerfully on the character and imagination of a kindred race than a morally severe monotheism. For a long time the heights (Bamoth), on which the sun-god (Baal-Samin) was adored, proved a snare and a stumbling-block to the Israelites.

The observance of the seventh day by abstinence from servile

45 Reuss, *Die Geschichte der heil. Schriften des A.T.* 1881, p. 38. Saussaye, p. [illegible], seq.

46 Compare Scholz, *Götzendienst und Zauberwesen bei den alten Hebraeern.* Regensburg, 1877.

work is one of the most remarkable institutions peculiar to the Semitic race, more especially to the Babylonians. They called it Sabbath. The worship of the stars (planets) supplies the likeliest explanation. The oldest Hebrew calendar fixes on seven as the astronomical number for the week, and twelve for the new moons. This latter fact shows that the phases of the moon could not determine the division of weeks.

What the Assyrians believed about a fu ure life is shown by their funeral rites. The Assyrian dead were conveyed to Chaldæa to be buried in that holy land. The body was swathed in bandages, and each hand held a sort of club, which vas without doubt a religious emblem. A supply of food and water was placed within reach of the dead. The care bestowed on their graves and funeral ceremonies are a sure sign that Assyrians and Babylonians believed in immortality.[47] The legend anent Istar's expedition to hell is a decisive proof. Hence the Greeks and Romans accounted for their belief in immortal life by tracing it both to Syrian and Egyptian sources.

Moreover, the Assyrians and Babylonians were deeply imbued with the idea of sin, to which they gave vent in their penitential psalms. One of their prayers reads like a penitential psalm from the Old Testament. It opens with the words: "O "Lord, my sins are many and my transgressions great, and the "gods in their anger have smitten me with affliction, sickness "and sorrow. Do thou convert into righteousness the sins "which thy servant hath committed."[48] Again, in all their public documents there breathes a spirit of piety, as well as the consciousness of sin. Their worship, with its sacrifices and offerings, and festive processions in which the statues of the gods were borne along, was so magnificent that the prophets warned the Jews not to let it captivate their hearts.*

47 Vigouroux, iii, pp. 107, 111, 119.

48 Kaulen, *Assyrien und Babylonien*, Freiburg, 1882, p. 145, seq; Fesch, p. 95.

* Baruch, vi, 3, seq.

3. The Arabians.

Hitherto no mention has been made of the Arabians, but we shall have to discuss them hereafter in connection with Islam. Their religion, however, does not call for much comment. It may be described in general terms as the coarsest and most uncultured of the Semitic religions. They, too, like other Semites, profess monotheism after a fashion. This much may be granted without accepting Renan's view, viz., that monotheism is a racial characteristic of the Semites, and a sign of the penuriousness of their religious ideas. Allah, their god, answers to the El and Ilu of the other Semitic tribes. In later times they were much addicted to worshipping the stars.

This sketch of so-called civilized races affords sufficient proof that their corporate action was negative rather than positive. It proves how helpless was the human will to frame for itself a proper rule of life, and how powerless was human reason to discern with certitude the end of man. Still their action was positive in so far as disgust with irrational polytheism and nature-worship ultimately awakened loftier aspirations in noble minds, and prepared them to receive better things. Men had been searching for the true God when the true idea of God was hidden by a cloud of myths and errors; they had been watching for the day of revelation to dawn; they had cried aloud for help; they had fondly believed that magic and divination were instinct with divine inspiration; and at length they despaired of having their moral sores and bruises healed under the old order of things. All this fruitless search, this unproductive faith, this hoping against hope, had filled the Jewish temples with proselytes, and cleared the course for the preaching of the gospel. Philosophy, too, in spite of its aberrations, had kept religious consciousness aglow, and awakened a yearning for immortality and an infinite ideal;

it had directed the gaze of men to a future lite, and had taught them to lean on hope. True, indeed, the great mass of Eastern nations are still outside the pale of Christianity ; but it should not be forgotten that the time which Divine Providence has allotted for the development and redemption of the human race must not be measured by a human standard.

CHAPTER IV.

UNCIVILIZED RACES.

It has already been made clear that the deification of nature in one or other of its many forms has been a factor in the religious development of most nations. The tribes inhabiting Western Asia were pre-eminently nature-worshippers. Their naturalism, however, is quite distinct from the religion of uncivilized races, whose idea of God scarcely rises above nature, and who are almost wholly destitute of moral and religious consciousness. According to modern naturalistic and evolutionary theories, all human development had its beginning in these "savages." On the other hand, the philosophers of the eighteenth century, starting with an æsthetic conception of "pure nature" as opposed to corrupt nature, regarded the natural or uncultured man as the innocent and incorrupt ideal of humanity. Nowadays, of course, this theory has been universally abandoned. A better acquaintance with savage life in Africa and the islands of Oceania has completely dispelled the illusion. The natural man is often a refined and highly intelligent beast, swollen from top to toe with most brutal passions.[1] He lives neither in an Eden of innocence, nor yet in patriarchal freedom and peace. He is often held in bondage by use and custom, by cruelty, and the lust of dominion; and thus the wretchedness of his life is many times intensified. Savages have no history. Nevertheless they do not live, as it

1 W. Schneider, *Die Naturvölker, etc.* Paderborn u. Münster, 1885, I., p. 3 seq.

were, from hand to mouth. For common custom is all-powerful with them. Fashion and usage are real tyrants, to whom the natural man bends the knee. From this it follows that there is no natural man, no original savage in the evolutionary sense. Not everything in the savage is or ever was savage. He is the man of nature only inasmuch as he is satisfied with nature's bounty ; he is neither uncivilized nor semi-civilized. The bodily organization of savages is not of a lower order than ours. Moreover they are often quick-witted, though corrupt and degenerate.

In the first volume[3] we have already shown that no one of these peoples is wholly devoid of religion. But our information is so scanty, and our insight into their religious life is so oblique, that it becomes no easy task to say in what their religion precisely consists. All attempts at classification have proved inadequate. For if we accept the three well-known stages of development : fetichism, nature-worship, and systematic pantheism,[4] we must bring also the naturalistic religions of civilized tribes under the same categories. Some scholars, indeed, are disposed to set down the Phœnicians and the civilized tribes of America as "barbarians" and "savages." This at least shows that there is no clearly marked stage between the two great classes, and that a rigid scale, whether ascending or descending, is unreliable.

Generally speaking the creed of uncivilized tribes contains these articles : they believe in a superior being, whose realm lies more within than outside the order of nature ; in some kind of existence after death ; and in spirits, especially evil spirits. The superior being is represented under the most varied forms, but he never takes a human form. It is always superhuman. Still we cannot say that honour is paid to the supreme being as such ; for, the supreme being in the abstract is inconceivable to the savage. Even the "Great Spirit" worshipped by the Indians, is no ex-

3 In chapter ii. and following chapters.

4 Drey, *Die Apologetik als wissenschaftliche Nachweisung der Göttlichkeit des Christenthums in seiner Ercheinung*, 2 Ed. Mainz, 1844, ii. 71.

ception to the rule. In conception it is not so ideal as the word would suggest to us and as is sometimes contended; nor yet so mean and despicable as modern evolutionists would make out.[5] Savages form their notions on concrete and singular objects, and seldom rise above them. These they seek to realize in the visible world. Here is the clue to the fascination that fetichism has for all Africans, Hottentots and Kaffres excepted, and to its widespread diffusion in America and Oceania. A fetich is not any mere natural object, but an animated being. Thus others recognize the souls of the dead as fetiches. If fetichism did not actually spring from the ancestor-worship, which is very prevalent in Africa, it certainly received a considerable impetus therefrom.[6] The charmers and medicine-men, who haunt all the ways and bye-ways, are supposed to hold constant and intimate converse with the souls of the departed. Fetichism nowhere stands alone pure and simple; the fact is that the child of nature is disposed to make a fetich of all things connected with his faith. Whatever happens, he refers to the divine being, to spirits, and the souls of his ancestors; hence it is the divine being that brings good and bad fortune to him. But good and evil come to him from the outer world of nature. Therefore, he looks upon natural objects as the dwelling-place of god and spirits, and regards them as his fetich. The more he needs help in his struggle with nature, the more he is disposed to have recourse to spirits and magic, in order to repel the assaults of the evil spirits, who have gained a greater hold upon his imagination than the good. Many Negroes will neither begin the day's work nor go into battle unprovided with a talisman or fetich from the charmer (Fetizero, Ganga, Chitome). By having fetiches as his companions he hopes, by craft and force, to secure their aid. In distress of all kinds the multitude have recourse to Shamans, fetich-priests, and medicine-men. Should

5 Saussaye, p. 192. See against him Schneider, ii., 375, seq.

6 Gloatz, *Speculative Theologie in Verbindung mit der Religionsgeschichte*, Gotha, 1883, p. 278, seq.

their art prove unavailing they may be treated as ignominously as the impotent fetich. Here art steps in as an aid to nature. Some objects are regarded as naturally and particularly suited to the divine operation, and are manufactured with especial care for the purpose. Although savages may regard these artificial fetiches as gods, still, at bottom, there is but a confusion of ideas which is not quite unintelligible. Stones, trees, plants, animals, though worshipped in houses and temples, were never in good earnest held to be gods, but rather forms or instruments in which superior beings manifested themselves. Even a nature-worshipper must invest his god with as much personality as himself, since he conceives him individually and in the concrete.[7] The worship of god may be thrust into the background by a belief in haunting spirits; but this would be a decadence not a beginning of religion. The Totemism, so common among the Red-skins, is also a deflection from the right path. An animal is held up and worshipped as a totem, that is, as a progenitor of the race. This animal cannot be killed (laws of abstinence), and is revered as a patron of his race. Joined to this custom is the institution of the matriarchate. It is the wife that determines all relationship (polyandry), and persons of the same totem are forbidden to intermarry (exogamy). From the connection between these two institutions it is clear that the favourite deduction as to the absence of marriage is untenable.

Natural religion is set down as a religion of fear, because its dominant idea is that dread of natural phenomena, to which the child of nature is more subject than civilized man. By fetichism and magic and divination, savages seek to enlist the spirits on their side when battling with the adverse forces of nature. They heighten the barbarity of their sacrifices—human sacrifices connected with cannibalism—in order to appease the offended and angry deity. But by sacrificing, as a rule at least, not their best gifts or their best men, but criminals

7 Schneider, ii, 378.

and prisoners, they still show that the motive of their worship is inspired by selfishness. It must, indeed, be admitted that the religion of many negro tribes is full of imperfections and superstitions. Some acknowledge a supreme being but disregard him; others have neither idols nor temples, but see in the sun, moon, and stars an emanation of the deity. Yet in spite of all this, there is a grain of truth hidden amid a bushel of error. Nature-worship and superstition failed to wholly extinguish the light of that ancient religion which they had inherited.[8]

Savages, in so far as they give the past and future a thought at all, and are not wholly, like children, engrossed in the present, have their own peculiar solution of the riddles with which the universe and man are rife. They cherish many and sometimes elaborate stories about the creation. The comparatively high stage of development which these stories have reached among the Americans is especially noteworthy. Myths about creation, the flood and ancient civilization abound in America, and in the main agree. The supreme spirit is the creator. The world was snatched from the jaws of the enemy that was going to swallow it,—the water. Man grew out of trees, or came forth from caverns. But God gave him a nature worthy of men.[9] Some negro tribes also retain belief in a creator of the world,—an echo of that monotheism which was nowhere wholly stifled. New Zealanders and Hawaiians are said to have myths about the creation which resemble Orphic and Vedic poetry.[10] But of a well-reasoned doctrine of creation there is, of course, no trace whatever. The next life, as a rule, is conceived after the analogy of the present life. Hence the common necessaries of life are put in the grave, and very often the living relatives are sent after the dead, either by being mercilessly slaughtered on the grave, or by being buried alive. Children often slay their parents, who impose this task on them as

8 *Katholische Missionen*, Freiburg, 1887, No. 3, p. 51. Saussaye, p. 71, 184, 191.

9 Saussaye, p. 193. Schneider, II., 374 seq.

10 Schneider, II., 370. Compare *Revue de l'hist. des Relig.* 1886 (xiii.), p. 1 seq. Saussaye, p. 200.

a sacred duty. The grave is usually considered sacred, and is preserved from desecration. As the savage thinks death and disease are produced by wicked spells, he engages magicians to discover their authors. A drink of poison is considered an ordeal.

Although signs of a lofty morality are not wanting among some uncivilized tribes,[11] particularly among the inhabitants of Nicobar, as those who sailed round the world in the "Novara" testify, still the great majority are a prey to passions and licentiousness. Refined cruelty, heartlessness and animal sensuality are the melancholy characteristics of many savage tribes. Of justice and morality and family life in its nobler sense, they have often not the vaguest notion. The degraded condition of woman, and deep-rooted polygamy are the chief hindrances to missionary progress among the negroes. Unhappily, immorality is alarmingly on the increase, owing to the abuses and vices of the white man,—the Christian. The horrors which the white man, through his selfishness and greed of gold, has perpetrated, are indescribable. It would seem as though the utter ruin of these peoples were purposely aimed at. Only in Central and South America have the aborigines been in a measure preserved by mingling with their conquerors and settlers. But the Indians seem doomed. In Australia matters came to a head even more rapidly, for the last of the Tasmanians died in 1880.[12] Those on the mainland now number only a few thousand. To justify the course of events it has been alleged that savages coming in contact with civilization necessarily go to the wall; but the statement is as little justified as the parallel proposition, formulated in the like interest, concerning the inferiority of the negro race. The history of America gives the lie to both. For, as the history of the Reservations under the care of the Jesuits proves beyond question, had not the white man introduced corruption, the Indians

11 Schneider, II., 373.

12 *Controverse*, 15, Mai 1885, p. 125.

might have been reclaimed by benevolent Christian instruction. Whether modern efforts to civilize Africa and Oceania will fare better, events will show.[13]

Though savages have but few wants, their lot is nevertheless sad and gloomy. Their hard and joyless life has left its impress on their religion. They see more of the dark than of the sunny side of nature. By toil and sweat they earn their living. They are ruled by force and fear. Can it be wondered at, then, that the feeling of gratitude should be stunted in its growth, and find little or no expression in their religion? Is it surprising that they should ascribe to invisible spirits the same motives, caprices and passions as they find to be the springs of their own actions? Is it surprising that, having no thought for the good God, they should give the lion's share to the devil, and impute all evil to divine wrath? The sunny side of the divine government of the world is for them almost in total eclipse. For this reason all natural religions glimmer with deep streaks of melancholy. The feelings of dread and dependency preclude true joy. Life's true value is unknown, and death is peacefully welcomed as a deliverer.[14] The cruel custom of tattooing is religiously observed by the South Sea Islanders, who likewise, in common with many negro tribes, were wont to practise circumcision.

For a fuller account we must refer the reader to Schneider's "*Naturvölker*" and the copious and useful literature therein quoted. From its pages we extract the following summary on savage tribes.[15]

"Uncivilized peoples generally stand on a higher religious "scale than those few tribes which are held up as samples of "irreligion. Anyone who studies from reliable sources the "spiritual condition of savages, will be convinced, unless his "mind be warped by prejudice, that the natural man is not

13 Schneider, I., 28.

14 Teichmüller, *Religionsphilosophie*, Breslau, 1816, p. 219. Somewhat milder, Schneider, II., 397, 403.

15 Schneider, II., 387.

"comparatively poverty-stricken in religion, but that re-"ligion guides him at every turn. Semi-civilized tribes, "in private and public, in domestic and social life, are "fenced round by a complicated system of customs and "conventionalities which, having in nearly every case a "religious sanction, are observed with a conscientiousness "that might often put a devout Christian to shame. For "instance, there is the sanctification of the Tabu in Poly-"nesia, and similar institutions in Australia, Africa and "America. The natural man, being a creature of sense, "is the child of the hour, and a slave to his passions; but "the free and untamed savage always stops short at the "barrier set up by the commandments and customs of his "religion. These he never dares to violate. He is in-"capable of committing a sacrilege. Nothing on earth "would induce him to touch anything that the consecra-"tion of the Tabu or the blessing of the fetich has with-"drawn from profaneness, or to break an oath, or the word "in which he has appealed to the gods. However hard "and barbarous the injunctions and prohibitions supersti-"tion imposes on him, he never evades or trangresses "them. In his estimation there is no worse misfortune "than to incur the anger of the deity, and once incurred, "his greatest anxiety is to propitiate it. For this purpose "he shrinks from nothing, and he endures the most severe "penances with a heroism worthy of a Christian penitent."

Everywhere the splendour of the divinity is seen to be on the wane; myths are growing poor and thin in thought, and religious ideas are entering on a backward course. Instead of being bright and sunny, religion is growing more and more burdensome and gloomy. None but a prejudiced mind can see aught but fallen greatness[16] in the supreme gods of the Australians, South Sea Islanders, Indians, and African Negroes. No impartial enquirer will shut his eyes to the degeneracy that actually exists in savage tribes. Even Darwin assigns to primitive man a higher place on the moral ladder than to the savage. The so-

16 ibid. p. 405.

called savage, he thinks, has gained in intelligence but lost in instinct. The first man was not so grossly sensual as many savages now are. Men cherished their wives and protected them from assault. Infanticide was unknown; early betrothals and polyandry were forbidden. Women were not treated as slaves.[17] It is now generally concluded that no portion of the human race is, strictly speaking, any longer in a state of pure nature; that a sort of civilization reigns everywhere; and that, consequently, such phrases as "tribes of nature" and "savages" are to be understood in a relative sense.[18] It is therefore very risky to argue back from these to a state of nature. The cruel customs and sacrifices of American savages are not, in many respects without a parallel among the civilized tribes of Mexico, Central America, New Granada, Peru, and the territory watered by the Mississippi and Ohio; but it is doubtful whence the civilization of these tribes was derived. Their buildings seem almost planned on Assyrian and Babylonian models. We know, indeed, from history that America had relations with Asia; but, for all that, these civilized tribes are an enigma. Did the aborigines of America import a higher civilization from elsewhere? or were these tribes later arrivals? And if so, whence came they? If writing be considered a work of civilization, then only the Mexicans can be numbered among civilized tribes. The Incas of Peru traced their descent from the children of the sun, who were the first to bring civilization to the earth. In like manner, the Mexicans say that civilization and custom owe their origin to the god Quetzalcoatl. His reign was the golden age:—unruffled peace, and no human sacrifices. But many famous men were offered up in sacrifices to the supreme god of the Aztecs, Huitzilopochtli, the war-god.

Of the civilized Mongolian tribes (the Chinese and Japanese), we have already spoken. To define the religion of Mongolian savages is as difficult as to determine the Mongolian race. Their

17 Schneider, i., 69.
18 Saussaye, p. 24.

numbers are so great that they have repeatedly influenced Western development; but they have no vitality, and are indifferent to religion. They believe in *Tengere*, the supreme god who dwells in heaven, and in *Erlik*, a dangerous god who dwells in the lower world. The most distinguishing work of their religion is an advanced form of magic, called Shamanism, which is transmitted by inheritance. The Shaman throws himself into convulsions, and seeks, while in this state, to learn the will of the gods through the spirit of his forefathers. He can penetrate heaven and the lower world. It is his business to offer sacrifices. The victims slain in sacrifices are horses. When an oath is taken, or a vow or promise made, the blood of the animal offered in sacrifice is drunk.[19] The words spoken by the chief Mengku to the Franciscan Rubruk have become famous: "We Mongols believe that there is a god in whom we "live and die, and to whom our heart is turned. But, just as "god has endowed the hand with several fingers, so has he "pointed out divers ways to men. To you Christians he has "given the Scriptures, and you walk not in them. . . . To "us he has given the prophets; we do what they tell us, and "therefore we live in peace."

Eusebius thinks that the gradual growth of religion (which compared with the Gospel is gross superstition), is due to a period when the human race was in a godless and immoral state. It resulted either in star-worship or hero-worship.[20] Prudentius has no hesitation in drawing a parallel between the development of the human race and that of the individual man. In the beginning man had an earthward bent; *ceu quadrupes egit.* By degrees he acquired a kind of education; but he thus also awakened the vices slumbering within him. Then, he says, came the time for thinking of divine things, and providing for eternal salvation. Modern Folklorists go still

19 Wutke, *Geschichte des Heidenthums*, i. 216. Weiss, *Apologie*, i. 5.
20 *Praepar. Evangel.* II., 5, 4. Prudentius, c. Symm, II., 277 seq.

further.[21] In opposition to philologists, who explain the formation of myths by the influence of language on thought, they contend that myths originated among savages, whose sagas and legends, they say, give us, so to speak, a peep into the workshop in which myths were forged, and disclose the psychological basis of myths and religion. This would be all very well if we were dealing with an incorrupt state of nature, and with the simple, unspoilt child of nature. But, as the preceding sketch has shown, this is not the case. A continuation of the sketch, if extended as far back as prehistoric times, would undoubtedly reveal a lower order of civilization; but we should be no nearer a solution of the question as to whether this was the original or a degenerate condition of men. The bridge between savages and civilized races would still be wanting. History tells the dates of civilized peoples only. Of their previous early development we have no information. Nay, more, since the very history that is known reveals a backward movement, it is clear that they have degenerated from a higher spiritual level. However much they may have grown in knowledge, religious thought has made no progress, but has been sinking deeper and deeper into the mire. Morality fared no better, as Greece and Rome, and all the East that has not been leavened by Christianity, bear witness. In the days of yore, even Turanian civilization stood higher than at present. It is, therefore, hoping against hope to expect a higher civilization to spring spontaneously from natural religions. If civilized people are incapable of religious elevation, savages are still more so. Their preparation for Christianity was chiefly negative, and lay in revealing their miseries and utter helplessness, while that of civilized peoples was positive, inasmuch as it mightily awakened the consciousness of sin, and the sense of the need of redemption. Civilized peoples have preserved more of the primitive revelation in connection with the natural knowledge of God,

21 Compare *Revue de l'hist.*, 1886 (xiii) 169, 197. As chief representatives are named: Schwarg, *Der Ursprung der Mythologie*, Berlin, 1860. Lang, *Custom and Mythology*, 2 ed. Reference is also made to the anthropological method of Tyler.

On the other hand they also oppose great obstacles to the progress of Christian missions, especially in the East, by reason of the power inherent in custom and history, which resists innovations in religion. All heathendom, both in the Old World and the New, preserved the tradition of a happy age in the past, and cherished the hope of a brighter future, when the Redeemer to come should break and destroy the power of the evil spirit.

Max Müller's linguistic argument for the unity of the Indo-Germanic race has been already brought forward. The striking unanimity with which they designate the supreme god as "heavenly father," shows that in ancient times all the Indo-Germanic tribes not only spoke the same language, but also worshipped the same god. Modern ethnographers look askance at this proof, but evolutionists, including Mr. Herbert Spencer, have no counter-demonstration to offer. We may even give it a still wider application. Not only Hindus, Greeks, Latins, Germans and Slavs, but Semites, Turanians, Polynesians, Negroes and Red-skins, have assigned the same rank to the supreme god, and honoured him under the title of "Heaven." What a wonderful coincidence ![22]

22 *Revue*, 1886, No. xiv., p. 108.

CHAPTER V.

THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL.

One branch of the great Semitic stock still remains for discussion,—the people of Israel. In the beginning, its position in history was seemingly unimportant. In numbers it was greatly inferior to the powerful Oriental monarchies. Still it merits special and exceptional consideration, inasmuch as it was the chosen people. It possesses a sacred literature that has no parallel in the Semitic family, perhaps none at all, save in Christianity. Its religion, taking its rise in a divine revelation, has worked effects that far outdistance those of all other pre-christian religions. Nowhere else do we find the great religious problems solved so clearly and so simply.

One God created heaven and earth and all things, including man. And the Creator, in His goodness, endowed man, both in soul and body, with rich gifts. But man broke down under the test to which his free-will was put; and thus sin and death, evil and misery, were let loose on the world. The temptation was the work of a fallen spirit, through whom sin and death came into the world. But the good God, instead of leaving His fallen creatures to their evil fate, forthwith implanted in their hearts hope in a future Redeemer; and His fatherly providence guided them in their earthly pilgrimage. The effects of the first sin were not slow in revealing themselves: belief in the one true God became weaker and dimmer, as time went on, until it was all but lost, while the floodgates of moral corruption were opened. One seed, however, from which the new Israel was to spring up, was saved.

Cain slew his brother Abel in envy; but Seth took Abel's place and perpetuated the god-fearing race. And when the Sethites had also fallen into sin and idolatry, Noe was just before God, and was saved from the general destruction. Cham and Japheth soon forgot God's mercy and the terrible chastisement they had escaped, and were wanting in respect to their father. Sem, however, a worthy scion of Noe, became the father of a generation to whom God entrusted His revelation. When the Semites, too, were on the brink of idolatry, God set Abram apart to serve the true God, and told him to leave home and kindred, and to go into a land that He would show him. The descendants of the patriarchs, after varying fortunes, were pining away in Egyptian bondage, and were compelled to serve false gods. At length God chose Moses, and made him His instrument in delivering the people from the bodily and spiritual bondage under which they were groaning. God revealed Himself to Moses by expressly declaring Himself to be *Jahve* (Jehovah). Him who is,—in contradistinction to the gods of the heathen, who are not, and by empowering him to defy Pharaoh and all his host. In the desert God renewed with His people, through Moses, the covenant He had formerly made with Abraham; He gave His commandments, set up a special divine worship, and prepared His people, during forty years of wandering, for their entrance into the promised land.

Only by slow degrees and after many a hard fight was the land of Canaan conquered. Not infrequently several of the twelve tribes were in danger of annihilation. But, just as frequently, God raised up "Judges" who marshalled the warriors of Israel under Jahve's banner, and routed their foes. Under Samuel and Saul there grew up that theocratic and national unity which enabled the people to hold their own against foes who were pressing them from every side. In the Jerusalem that he had conquered, David planned, and his son Solomon built, with royal magnificence, a central sanctuary. The theocracy—such is the

name given by Josephus to the Israelitic form of government—had now reached its zenith. At Solomon's death the kingdom was broken up into two unequal parts. The ten northern tribes revolted, and formed themselves into the kingdom of Israel, and publicly professed idolatry. The small kingdom of Juda, to which the promises were given, held fast, with occasional breaks, to the service of the temple and the worship of Jahve. God sent the prophets to save king and people from idolatry and corruption, and to keep alive in them the pure knowledge of Himself. But God's vengeance, long delayed, at last came. In 722 the Northern Kingdom was destroyed, and its people led captive into Assyria. In 606 (598) the same fate overtook Juda and Jerusalem, and the Jews were carried in captivity to Babylon. But while the ten tribes were absorbed in the population, a remnant of Juda and Benjamin was saved. Guided by the prophets Ezechiel and Daniel, the Jews did penance in Babylon for their past sins, and kept their hearts free from idolatry. After the Persian conquest of Babylon in 538, some returned to the Holy Land (536) and religiously remodelled their lives on the law. A century later a further contingent returned under Esdras and Nehemias. Under the second temple the leaders introduced reforms to regulate religious life, according to the strictness of the law. The school of exile and adversity had a wholesome influence upon the Jews; it chastened and fortified their hearts. Belief in Jahve, the one true God, had now so firmly taken root, that no wind of doctrine could move it. At the time of the Seleucidæ, many Jews gave their lives rather than transgress Jahve's commands. The Law was observed with painful exactitude. About this time a special body of learned men was formed in order to expound it. These were the "Doctors of the Law." To prevent the least transgressions the Law was fenced around with a number of petty ordinances. The evils consequent upon this step were further increased by the subsequent formation of parties—a thing quite contrary

to the spirit of the theocracy. The Sadducees had become reconciled to foreign rule, while their antagonists, the Pharisees, insisted on the strict observance of the law. In the synagogues the law and the prophets were read aloud and explained; and men were trained in scriptural knowledge in Rabbinical schools at Jerusalem. On festivals the whole nation assembled in the temple at Jerusalem, and their faith, their trust in God, and expectation of the Messias thus received fresh strength. The victories of the Hasmonæan dynasty again aroused a consciousness of political independence. In 63 B.C. began the Roman supremacy, which from 40 B.C. was exercised through the Idumæans (Herod the Great.)

Such is a sketch of the history of Israel, culled from the Old Testament, which, however, has been violently attacked in modern times. Peyrère, Spinoza, Richard Simon, Le Clerc and others had already called attention to the complex character of the Pentateuch. In 1753 Jean Astruc, a French physician, started what is called the *documentary* hypothesis, chiefly with reference to the historical portions of the Pentateuch (the Elohistic and Jehovistic informant). In 1805 Vater broached the *fragmentary* hypothesis, in dealing especially with the legislative portions of the Pentateuch. A third hypothesis, which may be called the *supplementary*, attempted to fuse the former two into one, and was advocated by Tuch, Stähelin, De Wette, Renan, Ewald, Knobel, Fürst. According to this theory the original document was from time to time enlarged by the addition of new portions, and Deuteronomy was entirely a later addition. English Deists, French Encyclopædists, and German Rationalists, the sworn enemies of revelation, attempted by every means to undermine the historical character of the sacred Scriptures, in order to show that it was made up of myths, which had grouped themselves round real or fabulous personages. In 1834 Reuss contended that the Prophets were older than the Law, and the Psalms more recent than both.[1] In 1835 Leopold George and Wilhelm Vatke

1 Reuss, *Geschichte der heil. Schriften, A.T.* Braunschweig, 1881, p. vii.

launched the same hypothesis independently, but it finally received its name from Graf, the disciple of Reuss. The theory of Graf runs thus: The book of Josue must be joined on to the five books of Moses, so as to form a Hexateuch, because the conquest of Canaan is clearly the closing chapter of the patriarchal history. Deuteronomy being set apart, the remainder can be traced to two sources: the *original* (*legal*) *or Elohistic* document, and *an historical or Jehovistic* document, so called from the preponderance in one or other of the names for God, Elohim and Jehovah. The original or legal document is embodied in the main in Leviticus and parallel passages in Exodus and Numbers: Exodus, cc. XXV-XXXI.; XXXV-XL.; Numbers, cc. I-X.; XV-XIX.; XXV-XXVI. Its purport is mostly legislative. It contains the ceremonial law and the quadruple covenant with Adam, Noe, Abraham and Moses, the last of which or the Mosaic law, indicates the proper scope of the writer. The historical document is essentially in the nature of a narrative. It begins with the creation of man, and is chiefly taken up with the history of the patriarchs. It touches on legislation only in so far as this last bears on history (Exodus, cc. XX.-XXIII.; XXXIV.) Hupfeld argued that certain parts of the Pentateuch, which had been assigned either to the legal or historical document, were in reality traceable to a third source, the junior Elohist, or, as he is now simply called, the Elohist. While, however, Hupfeld assumed that these three streams were running side by side, till a later writer turned them into one channel, Nöldeke maintained that the Elohistic portion was merely an undercurrent of the Jehovistic stream.

In this later form Graf's hypothesis has found a strenuous advocate in Wellhausen, from whom it has been called the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. In the latest edition (1886) of his Prolegomena to the history of Israel, where he admits that the researches of Kuenen have rendered some alteration in the theory necessary, he grapples with the "Problem." He decides

in favour of the opinion that there are two main divisions in the Hexateuch, although, he thinks, it is every day becoming more evident that both are complex in structure.[2] Further, there are some spurious or posthumous elements, which will fit into neither. He labels the book of history, that is the Jehovistic narrative, as JE, its Elohistic source as E, the Jahve source as J, and the sacredotal (legal) codex or original document as P. Of this last he ascribes the authorship to Esdras, about 444; Deuteronomy he assigns to the year 621, and the book of history to the early days of the kings.[3] Other writers agree with him, on the whole, as to the date of authorship, but they differ considerably in determining the amount of matter belonging to the several periods and authors. Dillmann, in his latest commentary on the Pentateuch, makes the Ephraimistic E anterior to Jeroboam II.; but J, which is dependent on E, and of Jewish origin, was not composed before the middle of the eighth century. On the other hand Dillmann agrees with Nöldeke, Schrader and others in thinking that Deuteronomy is a later production; but he is firmly convinced that the sacerdotal codex is older than Deuteronomy. This is the chief point of difference between the two sections of the critical school. There are still many writers of this school who look upon the Elohistic document or the book of Origins as the oldest portions of the Thorah, while the first-named authors regard it as the most recent.[4] But all agree in rejecting the Mosaic authorship. "If one thing is certain in

2 Compare also Reuss, p. 251 seq. Collections of the Jehovistic portions on page 252. History of the Patriarchs up to Exodus xxiv., and again xxxi., 18,-xxxiv. From Leviticus nothing. From Numbers x, 29-xii., 16; xiii., xiv., xv., xx. (two different sources); Again, xxi.-xxiv., xxv., 1-5; Some small portions in xxxii., and the last verses of xxxiii. From Deuteron. only fragments in chapters xxvii., xxxi., xxxiv. As regards Genesis, all his predecessors have ascribed the following portions to the Jehovist: Gen. ii., 4-25; iii., iv. v., 29; vi., 1-9; vii., viii., ix., 18-27; xi., 1-9.

3 Kayser, *Die Theologie des A.T.*, edited by E. Reuss, Strassburg, 1886, p. 161, where he assigns the year 444 as the very earliest date; but compare p. 68. Also Reuss, p. 249. E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das A.T.* 2 ed. Giessen, 1883, p. 54.

4 Kayser, p. 169.

"Old Testament criticism, it is that Moses did not write the "Pentateuch."[5]

The discussion of this hypothesis, which at present overshadows the whole field of Old Testament criticism, properly falls within the province of exegesis. Apologists, however, cannot afford to ignore it, first and chiefly because, in Germany at all events, Catholic exegesis has hardly deigned to notice it,[6] and because general questions and principles of revelation are involved. In this respect French Catholics are in advance of the Germans, for they both saw the danger ahead and strove might and main to meet it. It is naturally more pregnant with mischief to French than to German theology. "It is high time," says Broglie, a modern French apologist, "for Catholics to look full in the face the grave questions with which the Pentateuch and the history of Israel are bristling. It is time to take up arms in defence of a domain that is ours, which the enemy is threatening to wrest from us." Catholic theologians, therefore, cannot dispense with a survey of the method and results of this criticism, which aims at nothing less than revolutionizing the entire literary, historical and religious character of the writings of the Old Testament. Such are the momentous issues at stake.[7]

The first question, then, that presents itself to us, is the general question of the history of religion. Nor can we do better than make this question our starting-point. By so doing we shall follow both the order of things and the course of history itself. The main issue is simply this: Was the religion of Israel in its beginning monotheistic or polytheistic? The Law says the former, critics and religious historians the latter. Which is right? Is the history of religion described in the Old Testament merely a branch of the religious history of the

5 Kayser, p. 31. Reuss, p. 71 seq. In the same way Hermann, Schultz, Popper, and lately also Delitzsch.

6 Compare Koenig, *Alter. u. Entstehungsweise des Pentateuch.* Freiburg 1884. Flunk *Die Ergebnisse der negativen Pentateuchkritik.* *Zeitschr für Kath. Theolog.* ix, 472, 595. Selbst, in *Katholik* 1882 I. 4. Kulten, *Einleitung*, ii, 167.

7 *Katholik*, l. c. p. 338.

Semites, and to be treated according to the principles of evolution? Or must we recognise in it a supernatural element, a special revelation from God? If a negative answer be returned to the latter question, then the Old Testament, as known to us, is incomprehensible. Nay more, without a primitive revelation the general course of all religious history becomes inexplicable. Polytheism itself, as a hypothetical beginning, would be incomprehensible. Taking our stand, then, on the ground which our previous researches have cleared for us, we unhesitatingly answer, that Monotheism is the beginning, Polytheism is the decay of religion.

This conclusion is not challenged from Old Testament History. That there should have been two polytheists and one monotheist among Noe's three sons, may well seem surprising.[8] Again, of Sem's five sons only one held steadfast to monotheism, and polytheism found its way even into his family. Abram was forced to fly, lest he, too, should be infected with idolatry.[9] From Abraham the true faith passed to Isaac only, not to Ismael and the sons of Cetura; from Isaac it was transmitted to Jacob, but not to Esau. All this seems surpassing strange. The father must have instructed all his sons alike. All lived in the same house, and were witnesses of the same religious practices. And yet how uneven the results! But cannot we all bring forward many paralled cases from our own strange experience? What is there incredible in one remaining faithful and the rest falling away? Is it true to say, that men from being religious may become indifferent, or may cast religion aside altogether, or may become faithless in observing its precepts, but that they can never exchange one religion for a worse?[10] And are we justified, on the strength of this principle, in regarding the history of the patriarchs as incredible? To me, I must confess, the first important principle that the

8 Kayser, p. 21, 45. Reuss, p. 69.
9 Compare also Judith v, 6—9.
10 Kayser, l. c. Reuss, p. 61.

critics lay down seems very questionable. The proposition, "that all human ideas, even the most epoch-making, whether religious or otherwise, follow a regular psychological groove, and are grafted on pre-existing ideas,'"[11] if true, would be equally applicable to all kinds of development whether proceeding in a straight or crooked, in an ascending or descending line. Are there, then, no aberrations? Is there no ebb as well as flow? Has history always marched by a straight road that has no windings? Does not the history of both religion and science reveal many deviations from the right path? The history of the Semitic, Hindu, Iranian, Greek, Roman, and Egyptian religions is the history of a continuous decline, which like a flood overtook and swept into its current the vast majority of men. The Old Testament is therefore right and quite in keeping with history, when it attaches the preservation of the true knowledge of God to a few particular persons and families.

But it may be urged, does not a decline precisely prove that a lower stage of religion must have preceded? Could men fall into polytheism unless it had been at one time universal? Could the Jews have so far gone astray as to indulge in human sacrifices, if these had not been in early times a recognized and essential feature in public worship? This genuine Darwinian idea[12] would make all historical development incomprehensible. For the principle would really tell both ways. Spiritual progress would be also spiritual decline. Is it not more likely that, if man, by his strength and natural power, can advance, he can also go back? As the history of individuals and the race proves, human force and human passion is equal to the emergency. Hence to argue that Polytheism was formerly universal, because the Jews fell into it afterwards, is an unsound inference. All that one can conclude from it is the fact, that it is difficult to explain the existence of the pure monotheism of the Jews amid the mass of idolatry that encom-

11 Stade, *Theol. Lit. Ztg.* 1887. No. 9.

12 Schaaffhausen, *Anthropol. Studien*, Bonn, 1885, p. 552.

passed them on every side. Even Teichmüller[13] is forced to confess that the existence of a pure and untainted monotheism among the Jews is a phenomenon too unique to be explained by philosophy. For, he says, the beginning of moral consciousness does not all at once override and subdue the natural force of our passions ; nor is it possible to connect the ideas of right and wrong with God, unless man's idea of God has been already obtained from a religion of fear. It is an historical puzzle, he continues, to which speculation has no key, and which history alone can unlock. But history explains it by giving prominence to the person of Moses, who, having received pure monotheism by revelation, first indoctrinated the younger generation in the wilderness with it. The subsequent relapse, he argues, is intelligible ; for the strength of concupiscence must in the long run again bring the religion of fear into play, and thus set the tide rolling in the direction of idolatry. Any people, surrounded by heathen tribes, if thrown on its own resources, would assuredly incline to fall, without having previously passed through polytheism itself. As long as the sensual nature obtains the upper hand, as it does in ordinary men, a fall from a higher religious standard to a lower one,—even the abyss of sensual and naturalistic idolatry—is intelligible. This we could forecast as a natural consequence of sin, even if experience furnished no examples. Without a direct divine interposition Judaism would hardly have remained monotheistic in principle ; still less could it have evolved its pure and clear idea of God from a reeking mass of universal polytheism.

What idea in the Hebrew mind could have given it birth ? Such a "spontaneous generation" is inconceivable.[14] In the first place it would have to be proved that monotheism, the goal whither all development in ancient times tended, rose up in the time of Isaias "like a brilliant constellation from the bosom of

13 L. c. p. 289. Vigouroux, III., 34.

14 See Floekner, *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1877, p. 51 seq.

polytheistic darkness;"[15] and when proved, the fact itself would still be unexplained. Indifferentism or atheism is not the only antithesis to true religion. Such a supposition is contrary to the idea and history of religion; and may be possible in a people of modern education, but not in an ancient Eastern people. It is true that, in the beginning of their life in Canaan, the Jews could scarcely avoid combining their own religion with that of their neighbours. But the change between falling off and returning back must not be measured by a wooden rule.

In the people as a whole the event is intelligible. In many respects its religion is not very different from that of the Canaanites. It had divers gods: household gods (Terafim), gods of the stars and of heaven. Jahve was a national god, represented under various sensible symbols: men, oxen, and plants. In their immediate neighbourhood were Astarte and her college of priests, and the brazen serpent that healed diseases and the wounds inflicted by poisonous animals.[16] But even apart from extravagances, and in spite of the fact that Jahve was placed above all other gods, Holy Scripture brands their practices as simple idolatry. Nor are the supposed polytheistic reminiscenes of the writers sufficient proof to the contrary. We are as little warranted in concluding that human sacrifices were in vogue among the Jews, from the sacrifices of Abraham and Jephte, as from the sanctification of the first-born. It cannot be denied that human sacrifices are credited with a special propitiatory value *; but such isolated instances, which have withal an historical explanation, are no adequate proof that the children of Israel were originally addicted to this practice. Later on they sacrificed their children to Moloch. Was not this manifestly a relapse into the idolatry of their neighbours and kinsfolk? To say that images† were an integral

15 Fritz, p. 158.

16 Maspero, in his history of Eastern peoples, 4. Ed. Compare *Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol.* 1887, p. 183; also Soury, Renan and others. Kayser, p. 80. Vigouroux, III, p. 25. Flockner, *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1887, p. 55, seq.

* I. Kings, xv. 33. II. Kings, xvi. 2 seq. Micheas, vi. 7.

† Judges xviii; III. Kings, xii. 28; Numbers xxi 4—9.

part of primitive Semitism is incorrect. In Egypt, on the contrary, not merely living bulls, but even their images were adored. The serpent was the symbol of the healing art.

There is still another point which might seem strange, and requires explanation. The Old Testament connects the apostasy with individuals, without taking historical development into account. But this objection also rests on no solid ground. It is quite true that the sacred writers are wont to embody a principle in conspicuous personages, and throw on them the consequences it entails. But, at the same time, they let it be understood that those individuals, who generally became the progenitors of non-Israelites, broke loose from Tradition, and it is only their distant descendants who figure as out-and-out idolaters. Other Eastern writers also, Assyrians and Egyptians for instance, are accustomed to link the history of a nation to the genealogical table of families and races. This custom is so thoroughly patriarchal that it constitutes an argument for, rather than against, the age of the narrative. Genealogies have ever been current among Eastern nations.

Nor can the names by which God is designated be alleged as telling in favour of primitive polytheism. El, the commonest and most ancient name amongst the Semites, is the simple designation for the idea of God common to all men. Ilu was probably also the Assyrian name for the one God. El was the one God of the Hebrews, El-Kana the jealous God. Elohim, the plural of Eloah, is in form an abstract name. It does not, however, imply a plurality of Eloahs, for in ancient Hebrew it was never used in the singular. The singular Eloah was used for the first time towards the close of the eighth century by the poets, Job, Isaias, Habacuc and others; but even then the people had no scruple in continuing to use Elohim. Modern critics cannot, surely, take exception to this name, since, in their view, the Elohistic portions of the Hexateuch are the most recent, and the Psalms in which Elohim frequently occurs are subsequent to the captivity. Perhaps Elohim is a plural with an intensify-

ing force, to denote the majesty, omnipotence, and perfection of God.* The plural is often used in Hebrew to express the singular, unbounded, incomprehensible, and complex, as in Adonai, Schaddai.[17] Elohim, as applied to God, is always followed by a verb in the singular; but when it is used to denote idols, even the golden calf, the verb is in the plural. To this rule there are only about a dozen exceptions, whereas the passages in evidence that Elohim from the beginning denoted the one only God who created heaven and earth, are many and numerous. Jahve, too, denotes that same one God, but as the God of the covenant, who revealed Himself under this name to Moses.[18] Yet both names are often used indiscriminately. For this reason some writers try to relegate the much-respected "Jehovist" to the shades, because his existence hangs on critical studies and theories that must now be considered inadequate or confusing.[19] Were it not so, we should surely expect to find different kinds of worship for the different gods in ancient times. But for this there is not a shred of evidence. Nor is there any mention or indication of mythology. If Jahve is put forward more frequently as the Jewish national God, this was done solely to contrast Him with the heathen gods, the bare mention of whom (e.g. Chamos, the god of the Moabites†) does not imply recognition. In the eyes of the Jews Jahve was the God of Israel. The Jews still required a considerable amount of progress and education, before they were fully penetrated by pure monotheism, so as to conceive Jahve as the god of the universe, and of all nations. The command God gave them to annihilate the Canaanites, and the helping hand He extended to them while battling with their enemies, would lead them to believe that Jahve was the loving father of none but Israelites. It is a most signifi-

* I. Kings xxviii. 13; Ps. lxxxii. 6.

17 Vigouroux, III., 46. Reuss, p. 77.

18 Exodus III., 14, vi., 2, 3. Compare Haneberg, *Geschichte der Bibl. Off.*, Regensburg, 1863, p. 197. Kaulen, p. 168.

19 Reuss, p. 249.

† IV. Kings xxiii. Jerem. xlviii. 7, 13, 46. Num. xxi., 29. See *Kirchenlexicon*, art. "Chamos."—Tr.

cant fact that the Jews never recognized a goddess, while in every other nation natural religion degenerated into sexual dualism. At one time, indeed, they worshipped Aschera and Astarte ;* but this crime was very different from putting a goddess on an equal footing with Jahve. Although they set up statues of Aschera near Jahve's altars, they refrained from representing God in company with a goddess. Witness the severe decrees against prostitution and its wages, as compared with the *hierodulia* of the Gentiles.** Only if actual transgressions were inexplicable either by psychology or the example of the neighboring peoples, could it be concluded that prostitution had existed as a religious institution. Does the prohibition to kill imply that killing was previously lawful? Might it not suffice to say that the command was intended simply to warn the people against the bad example of the Canaanites?

But it is furthermore objected that the sacred writers not only unconsciously and unintentionally introduced reminiscences of an earlier polytheism into their narrative, but that they speak quite plainly and openly on the subject. "Put away the gods which your fathers served in Mesopotamia, and in Egypt, and serve the Lord. But if it seem evil to you to serve the Lord, you have your choice: choose this day that which pleaseth you, whom you would rather serve, whether the gods which your fathers served in Mesopotamia, or the gods of the Ammonites, in whose land you dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."† This passage is supposed to prove that the Israelites, before the days of Moses, were polytheists. Moses, we are told, instructed them with monotheism, but the masses had not been leavened with this religion. Many held out against it in the wilderness, and in Josue's time were still cleaving to their old faith or superstition. In order to thoroughly wean them from it, it was necessary to make a law or decree. But, as we shall see, even this supposed decree

* Deut. xvi., 21.
** Vigouroux, III., 76, 230.
† Josue xxiv., 14.

proved ineffectual. Meanwhile, in answer to the above objection, let the reader in the first place peruse the whole chapter of this "very old Jahvistic section;" he will then see clearly how hugely the passage has been misapplied. Josue first recalls all the benefits God had bestowed on His people. The God of Israel chose Abram, guided him, and multiplied his seed, and gave him Isaac. And to Isaac He gave Jacob and Esau. And He sent Moses to set His people free from bondage, and brought them through the wilderness into the land of the Ammonites, delivered them from the hand of their enemies, and protected them against the foreign kings who fought against them. And He gave the Israelites a land in which they had not laboured, cities to dwell in which they had not built, and vineyards and oliveyards which they had not planted. After this striking introduction Josue proceeds: Now therefore fear the Lord, and serve Him with a perfect and most sincere heart, and put away strange gods, and so forth. Thus Jahve is the God to whom Israel owes its prosperity and well-being. It is not a question of deciding *which* God they will serve. Josue does not mean to leave them a free choice, but to deter them from Egyptian idolatry, which he explicitly traces to the pernicious influence exercised on them by the Egyptians. Thus, according to this very passage, Jahve had been the one God of Israel at least since the time of Abram. Their fathers had, indeed, adored strange gods in Chaldæa, but it was precisely for this reason that Abram was withdrawn from their midst. There is nothing, therefore, in this passage that militates against the consistent view of monotheism presented to us in the Old Testament history. There is but one passage that seems to tell the other way, where Jephte says to the king of the Ammonites: "Are not those things which thy god "Chamos possesses, due to thee by right? But what the Lord "our God hath obtained by conquest, shall be our possession."* This declaration, however, is rather a diplomatic speech than a

* Judges xi., 24.

confession of faith. Anyhow, it cannot thence be concluded that Jephte put Chamos on a par with Jahve.[21]

Nor, again, is idolatry proved to be the primitive religion of the Jews, by the lamentations[22] in which the prophets bewail their fall into idolatry in Egypt, and during their sojourn in the wilderness. It is quite gratuitous to say that these passages suppose that the worship of Jahve was not the original worship, or again, to say that nothing is more natural than to transfer a later religious condition to an earlier date. The very purpose of the rebukes of the prophets, is to hold up the transgressions to men's gaze; consequently they must imply that the duty of worshipping Jahve was known. Until a general habit of dating back can be proved from other quarters, the simple logical and historical interpretation is in full possession. We may then fairly retort: how then came the prophets to be brought on the scene at all * to chastise † those who had fallen away from Jahve? Had there been no one in the time of the Judges to safeguard the Mosaic idea and maintain the continuity between Moses and Samuel, the religion of Moses could not have endured. "At the c ose of the time of the "Judges, at all events, the Mosaic religion had gained so firm a "footing that a priest of Jahve like Heli, and a prophet like "Samuel, were most influential personages."[23] It was an axiom at that time that "Jahve was the god of Israel, and Israel Jahve's people." It may be that he, who first made this comparison, admitted the existence of other gods also, but it cannot be shown that he put them in the same rank as Jahve. Jahve ever towers above all others; and this fact shows the slight esteem in which others were held.‡ Monotheism, how-

21 Vigouroux III., 29. Compare Ruth, I., 15; I. Kings, XXVI., 19.

22 Ezech. XX, 5 seq; XXXIII, 8. Amos, V. 25 seq.

* Judges, VI. 8.

† Judges, I.; Kings, II, 27.

23 Kayser, p. 53 seq. Compare Wellhausen *Geschichte Israels*, I, 9. *Katholik*, 1887, I, 462 Finsler, *Darstellung und Kritik der Ansicht Wellhausens*, Zürich, 1887. Also Baethgen, in *Theol. Lit. Ztg.* 1887. No. 4.

‡ Ps. XCVI, 5; XCVII, 7.

ever, by no means precludes a belief in spirits, both good and bad.

How the Jewish people, in the midst of Egyptian corruption, could retain force and energy to hold on high the idea of the true God, and to hold fast to it through thick and thin, in spite of many relapses, is utterly inexplicable without some special religious and moral foundation. The ancient civilized nations around were fast degenerating; but Israel came forth from the crucible of affliction, destroyed, indeed, as a nation, but chastened and purified in religion and morals. "Apostasy, affliction; conversion, peace;" may be a somewhat monotonous melody, but there is a natural and historical ring about it, especially when we consider the difficulties that beset the path of a people that walked in the worship of a spiritual God, Jahve. The canticle of Deborah,† which admittedly comes down from the earliest times, supplies historical evidence in support of this view. Even Wellhausen is forced to admit, not only that an ideal notion of God's sovereignty existed in the earliest times, but also that religion was applied as a motive power to justice and morality, and that in no nation was the deity's relation to the fortunes of the people so mighty, and withal so pure, as among the Israelites. Again, the whole history of the Semitic religions has shown us that the ancient religion of Israel could not have been of a superficial kind, and a mere means of worldly blessedness. The Babylonian and Assyrian penitential psalms are in themselves sufficient proof that these nations were deeply impressed with the consciousness of guilt and the need of redemption. Would the Jews belie their past history by interpolating this moral ingredient in their religion at a late period? Would they, in the days of the Syrians and Assyrians, have invested with moral conditions a covenant that had existed between Jahve and Israel before the time of Moses? If so, what remains of the work of Moses, "who has acquired an

† Judges, v.

"epoch-making position for all time" in establishing and spreading the knowledge of God in the world?

That Moses taught a pure ethical monotheism no one will deny. For him Jahve is not merely that which is, but He who is, the Creator. In order to prove this we need not appeal to any controverted historical testimonies. Those of the recognized prophets are sufficient. They call Moses Jahve's ambassador,* and the first prophet.† They do not say that Moses was the first to propagate belief in Jahve, but that God sent him to set free His people. They, too, proclaim that Jahve is the God who brought Israel from the land of Egypt. All they sang in His praise culminates in this great central fact which, consequently, was an ancient popular belief. He is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; the God of the covenant made with Abraham. Moses is not the founder of the religion of Israel, but the mediator of the covenant that God made with His people. True, according to ancient notions, this covenant is represented as a compact, but then it is a compact on the part of God who, in return for fidelity, condescends to shower graces and blessings on His people and to assure them of prosperity and peace. God chose Israel in preference to all other peoples, and gave them the promised land. On their side the people, as God's children, swore allegiance and fidelity to their Father and Creator. This covenant was the very life-blood running through all the veins of Israel's history. Even negative criticism is constrained to do homage to the book of the Sinaitic covenant, and to concede that Moses was, in some sense, a lawgiver.[24] Josephus invented the word *theocracy;* but the thing which it expresses came from Moses, as the intermediary between Jahve and His people.

Why should such a covenant be deemed impossible? It has recently transpired that the idea of a covenant prevailed among other people besides the Israelites. *Baal-Berith* used

* Micheas vi. 4.
† Osee xii. 14.
24 Kayser, p. 31, 39.

to be explained as Baal who guards covenants or treaties (Ζεὺς ὅρκειος); but it is now seen to mean him with whom a covenant has been concluded.[25] If this fact were quite certain, it might occur to some one to urge that it tells against the reality of the covenant with Israel. But this is not the case. Apologists contend that coming supernatural facts have cast their shadows before in nature and in history; and this contention is generally admitted. It is not essential to a supernatural fact that nothing similar should be found elsewhere, or that it should not fit into its environment. But it is essential and necessary that there should be absolute authority and full certainty in regard to the way in which such facts are developed and represented. Although the idea of a covenant with the deity is not peculiar to the Israelites, still in Israel it appears in the most beautiful and perfect form, and is so far unique. It could not have been thus developed just before the captivity. Nor again could it be the outcome of mere natural reflection and development.

How could Moses have gained the ear of the people, if he had appealed to a God other than Him in whom they believed? Moses had grasped the meaning of Jahve better than many of his contemporaries, and preserved a purer idea of God; but Jahve was not a creation of Moses. Hence Moses was highly fitted to be an organ through which God could reveal His will. Again, it may be granted that this higher conception of God also rested on a strong natural foundation supplied from his education. Moses, holding the people's destiny in the hollow of his hand, is a figure that so overtops all else in Israel's history, that his position is intelligible only on the supposition that he held a high place in Egyptian society itself. Whatever may be the verdict in other respects on the esoteric teaching of the Egyptian priests, this at all events may now be confidently asserted: "Here we can see naught but a downward move-"ment,—the knell of consciousness of the unity of God. Mono-

25 Genesis, xiv. 13. Compare Baethgen l.c.

"theism must have preceded this."[26] It has been already remarked that the oldest papyri and inscriptions, and the Book of the Dead are pregnant with pure moral conceptions. If these were known before Moses' time to Egyptian priests, what historical ground can there be for calling in question either Moses' idea of God; or the promulgation of the Decalogue; or the antiquity of the whole Mosaic legislation? If a nobler moral teaching and a purer idea of God could obtain among the Egyptians from the first, how can we argue that the subsequent degeneracy of the Jews is a proof that they were not perfect monotheists in the beginning? The Decalogue, then, contained nothing but what Moses was well able to enforce.[27] But if this be so on the one hand, may we not also say, on the other, that it is hardly likely that he wished to issue these simple, moral, and religious precepts as something quite new and distinct from what had hitherto been in force? The precision with which they are formulated is new; the divine authority on which they are based is new; and the renewal of the covenant is new. Revelation supposes nature.

If, however, there be a disposition to appraise Egyptian influence at a lower figure, we shall have little objection to such a course. "Moses certainly did not convert Egyptian wisdom "into the religion of Israel. His work was creative, and its "monotheism of an original kind."[28] This statement, however, is true only inasmuch as the "prophet refined and purified the "old idea of God current among the people," and was, perhaps, the "first to deliberately cast it in a distinctly monotheistic "mould." For, at that time, as Genesis tells us, the people were inclined to idolatry. When the Israelites had been in bondage for five hundred years, Moses built them up into a people, instilled into them an idea of God purer than any known to the ancients, and laid the foundations of a civilization which

26 Strauss-Torney, *Essays*, 1879. See Naumann, *Wellhausens Methode*. Leipzig, 1886, p. 155.

27 Kayser, p 44. Reuss, p 90

28 Kayser, p. 32.

has gained them an unique position among all ancient nations. But this in no wise proves that all the patriarchs before Moses were enslaved to polytheism. "Should it "not rather be asked whether Moses did more than restore "the old heritage and hopes of his race! Above all, did "he not receive from his forefathers faith in the unity of "the God, who alone really is, and who created all "things?"[29] Though the historical difficulties be many and great, it will always remain next to impossible for critics "to really grasp the subsequent history of Israel, "unless they are prepared to see here a first mighty im"pulse given to it."

We are specially concerned not to underrate the "presupposed foundation" of the Mosaic legislation, since it forms the very starting-point in the theories of our opponents. Their appeal lies precisely to the religion, morality, and civilization of the ancients in general, and of the Egyptians in particular. If, at that time, Egyptian civilization had really attained such a commanding height, then the Mosaic legislation can no longer be challenged on *à priori* grounds. Then, again, it is no argument against the fact of a written legislation to say that oral tradition was the main channel of knowledge in ancient times. Since it is well known that ancient legislation was regularly written down, it is surely foolhardy to contend, after the manner of a later literary age, that Moses could have done no good by writing books at a time when the Israelites were certainly unable to read.[30] We possess Egyptian papyri three or four thousand years old. At a time when the art of writing was little in request among the Aryan tribes, it flourished in the valley of the Nile. "It is char"acteristic of the Egyptians that they felt a need, or, one "might say, a passion for writing." Hence the allusions in the Pentateuch to the art of writing go to show that the Pentateuch is a reliable history. As Moses, who had re-

29 Reuss, p. 76, 84.
30 Kayser, p. 31. Compare Vigouroux, II., p. 502; Kaulen, *Assyrien und Babylonien*, 3 Ed. p. 242. Also his *Einleitung*, II., p. 170.

ceived an Egyptian education, must have learnt how to write, so the Jews had also been brought up in the manners and customs of the Egyptians. Even supposing that the common people could not read, would a written law on this account be inconceivable or useless? Why were there Egyptian colleges of priests with a high-priest at their head? In like manner Moses had to provide a way and means by which the priests and leaders of the people had a rule to guide them in teaching and judging. Oral instruction was the rule, even at a later period, when the written law was certainly in existence. Thus, after the Captivity, the Law and the Prophets were read aloud in the Jewish Synagogues. In the Sermon on the Mount our Lord told his hearers: "It was *said* to them of old, thou shalt not kill."

We are, however, far from denying that, as time went on, monotheism and the Mosaic religion, mainly through the instrumentality of the prophets, were further refined and deepened. For it may be easily imagined that a people, whose education and morals were then at a low ebb, in comparing Jahve with the heathen gods, would make but a relative distinction between the two,—a mistake that often actually occurred. But there is no ground for assuming that such a modified monotheism and no other had existed up to the time of the prophets. As we have already pointed out, the main work of the prophets,[31] even the oldest, lay not so much in teaching the true God, as in punishing apostasy, and condemning the folly of forsaking the living God who made heaven and earth, to worship dumb idols, gods of wood and stone, and graven things, the works of men's hands. The prophets found in existence the idea of the one true God, however poorly it may have then been developed. It is labour thrown away to grope about for missing links that are supposed to mark the transition from relative to absolute monotheism. How could mere reflection have helped them to pass from the notion of a national god to that of the God of all nations?

31 Amos, II. 4. Mich. V. 12. Os. XIII. 4. Is. X. 5-15.

The characteristic idea in the Jewish monotheism, viz., that Jahve created the world, and is guiding its destinies in order to save His people, is older than the prophets. It dominates the whole history of Israel. It came by revelation; for no people ever soared to so high and pure a concept of creation. Even the golden age under David would not have brought it forth; still less could such a sublime thought have emanated at the period when the Jewish kingdom was on the decline. All the original Semitic names for God made some reference to power and dominion;[32] but this only shows what was fundamentally implied in them,—it gives us a principle and no more. Still, how great the difference between the Jewish and the ordinary Semitic idea of God! Let the keenness and intelligence of the prophets be appraised at the highest figure, they could never have effected a sudden transformation to monotheism. They were powerful enough, indeed, to make the moral order of the world respected; but only on the basis of an older revelation, and, we may add, on the strength of new revelations vouchsafed to themselves. Had they not received a divine mission, their open and heroic conduct, their enormous influence on the people's destinies, would ever remain a puzzle. Now and again some great men outrun history; but here we are dealing with an extraordinary institution that had endured for centuries. The stubborn opposition Moses and the prophets encountered from the people, of itself shows that revelation,[33] and not the mere enforcement of common law and custom, was in question. Again, Moses and the prophets form one connected chain. What is true of them, is true also of him. The prophets saw in vision a new prosperous kingdom rise up in the future, which was to restore the peace and happiness that reigned in the beginning. This ideal future, to which religious history nowhere affords a parallel, must have been modelled on an ideal past. The more we emphasize the steady and gradual character of religious develop-

32 Kayser, p. 83, 92, 112.
33 Reuss, p. 78.

ment, the more impossible it becomes to understand the future, predicted by the prophets, without reference to the past. Upon what could the prophets, especially the later ones, ground the hope of political and religious restoration, if not on the covenant which God, through Moses, had made with His people? Moreover, the moral education[34] which Israel underwent, was only the development of a principle already contained in germ in the Law. Later on we shall have occasion to consider the pedagogical side in the development of the history of revelation.

Even during the exile, when the people were down-trodden and oppressed, and their leaders held captive in Babylon, hope did not die out. It seemed to be hoping against hope, but the people were really full to overflowing with faith in Jahve, who had chosen His people, and had hitherto been their leader, alike in prosperity and adversity. They were buoyed up by the promise that God gave to Moses. As soon as they were set free from captivity they proceeded to restore religion. A century later, Esdras and Nehemias continued the woık of restoring the old religion of the people. The influence wielded by these two reformers was doubtless immense; but even they would have been powerless to introduce a radical change of principle. Such a change, though highly improbable, might be conceivable immediately on the return from captivity, because the historical connection with the temple had been broken. But a century later, it would have been utterly impossible to enforce regulations so closely bound up with social and religious life, as those contained in the priestly codex, had they not pre-existed in the main, and long before been regarded as law. The priestly element undoubtedly predominated among those who returned; but the priestly demands would not have met with general assent, had they not rested on an historical and divine foundation. Now that the voice of the prophets was heard no more, it is easy to understand why the Jews, after the hardships they had undergone during their exile, should have clung more

34 Wellhausen, *Prolegom.* 3 ed. 1886, p. 58. Fritz, p. 126.

tenaciously to the letter of the Law; but their acceptance of a new law, under such circumstances, would have been difficult to understand. The scribes may have interpreted the Law in a way favourable to themselves, but the Law and the Pentateuch must have been in existence, and recognized by the people. It is straining historical criticism beyond all limits, to ask unreserved assent to the proposition that, in a short time, the influence of the scribes had saturated all classes of society, the common people included, with such a knowledge and love of the law, that a universal opinion soon prevailed that Moses had given the law, and that the order of things had been undisturbed and unchanged since his days. Then, again, this law, though weighted with minute ordinances regarding every detail of life, was felt so little burdensome that "many psalms of the "time sang in praise of the blessings it brought in its train, "and, without prejudice to genuine pity and earnest faith in "the God and guardian of Israel, testified to the deep-felt joy at "seeing the beautiful service of the temple restored."[25]

And now the course of religious history we have been pursuing has brought us face to face with the second special problem with which we have to deal, namely, the authorship of Deuteronomy and the sacerdotal codex. The traditional doctrine of the Church, according to which the Pentateuch is substantially the work of Moses, is still in possession, even from a scientific point of view. Hence the first duty incumbent on the critical school is to show that the Church's title is historically unfounded. They must demonstrate with certainty that the belief in a divine revelation made to Moses, which percolates the whole history of Israel and Christianity, is a rope of sand. Generally, however, the critics bring the problem within still narrower limits. What is new in the post-Mosaic legislation, they say, is not to be looked for in the matter written, but in the form of writing, because the whole question reduces itself

25 Kayser, p. 165.

to fixing traditional custom.[36] The critics do not deny that a levitical tradition in regard to ritual existed as far back as the days of the kings; they merely deny that these existed in writing in a sacred official codex. "This important distinction should not be overlooked." Moreover, it must be admitted that Moses regulated and ordered the divine service, in its main features at least, such as it afterwards existed in Israel; in other words, it was he who began to make some of the oldest and sacred customs the vehicle of purer and higher religious ideas.

This limited view of the critics removes one stumbling-block at least from our path. But this is not enough. It is equally indispensable to the traditional theory that the law of Moses be acknowledged as of divine origin. And yet, even apart from this, it would surely be surprising if people like the Jews, who held so fast to tradition, could have been gulled into believing that the book just composed by their scribes, had actually been written long ago by Moses. How a law, written subsequently, should have been received as the law of Moses, cannot be explained either psychologically or historically, unless there existed a tradition to the effect that Moses had written down this Law. For Moses lived in historic times, in the full blaze of Egyptian civilization. In whatever light we may view the references to the Law, found in other books of the Old Testament, they certainly leave the impression that all subsequent written legislation had been built upon the Law. The first chapters of Deuteronomy quite bear out the supposition that the second law (Deuteronomy) is based on the Mosaic Law. The difference in formulating the Ten Commandments is no argument to the contrary, any more than different accounts of the same event, given by different or even the same authors, militate against the authenticity of their work. It tells neither against the writing of the Commandments, nor against the two

36 Reuss, p. 76, 80. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 423. On the other side, see Baethgen, *Theol. Liter. Ztg.* 1887, No. 4.

stone tables of the Law. It is precisely the fact that these tables were kept secret, which caused the knowledge of the Decalogue to depend on oral tradition. The prophets wrote down their revelations, and bore witness to the existence of good and able writers. At that time, again, judicial sentences were committed to writing;* learned explanations and commentaries of the Law were in request,† which may be said to have prepared the way for the later Pharisaical school of interpreters.‡ Is it credible that, in the days of the prophets, the old Law alone was unwritten, and handed down merely by word of mouth? Dillmann thinks it the most natural thing in the world to suppose that the ancient priests of the Central Sanctuary committed their Thoroth (laws) to writing. It is absurd, he says, to suppose that the laws concerning the priests and divine service were first committed to writing during the Babylonian captivity, when no divine service was held at all. To this Wellhausen replies: "Absurd it may be, yet true. That "high priests succeeded kings, rabbis, and the prophets, was "not progress, yet a fact. It is supposed that traditional "practices occasionally happen, as a matter of fact, to be "written down, only when they are in danger of dying out; and "that books are, so to speak, as one returning from the dead."

It is supposed! occasionally!! to happen!!! But we know for a certain fact that laws and ordinances regarding divine service were written down in early times. On Wellhausen's principle, the sacrificial tables recently discovered at Carthage and Marseilles (which are extracts from more comprehensive tables) might have been drawn up after the destruction of Carthage. Special interest attaches to these tables, because their contents exhibit many points of resemblance with the sacrificial legislation of the Old Testament. "The resemblance," says Bäthgen, "between the sacrificial tables of Marseilles and Leviticus is most "striking. Both enumerate the victims in the same order:

* Isaias x. 1. † Ibid. xxviii. 10, 13. Jeremias, viii. 8.

‡ Osee v, 6; vi. 6. Amos viii. 15; iv. 5 Isaias lxv. 5

"fat and lean kine, birds, fruits. The transcendent importance "attached to the holocaust in A (primitive document) which "according to Wellhausen is a later innovation, finds here an "exact counterpart; for the first place on the Marseilles table is "assigned to the Phœnician *kolal*, which answers to the Hebrew "*olah*. That the varying practice in regard to the priest's fees "was due to local differences, is clear from the fact that, according to the Marseilles table, the priests were paid in money and "kind, whereas on the first Carthaginian table (which in other "respects resembles that of Marseilles) money is not mentioned "except in sacrifices of winged creatures; but the hide of the "slaughtered beast became the priest's perquisite, as in Leviticus VII. 8. Still more important than these details is, in my "opinion, the fact that there existed in Carthage, for centuries "before its destruction, written sacrificial ordinances closely "resembling those of the Hebrews. It is a thoroughly modern "idea that the technicalities of sacrifices were viewed with "utter indifference in ancient times; it was precisely what the "priests most jealously guarded. These technicalities were "first orally transmitted, then written down; but the ancients "were never so unpractical as not to write down their laws "until they had fallen into disuse. Priests were the first to "learn the art of writing, and they naturally employed their "science to further what lay next to their hearts; and the priests "of Israel were no exception to the rule"

Even the critical school allow that something was written in early times, although the sacerdotal codex was not. The Jehovistic book is assigned to the time of Manasses, or about the eighth century, and from the part played by Joseph it is supposed to have been composed in Israel. But if so, how came Juda to have adopted it? Its adoption by Juda is intelligible on one supposition only: that it originated before the kingdom was divided. Nor is this supposition unlikely. After all, we cannot say that in Solomon's reign literature had no care or concern with ancient history.

We learn from the historical books that there were annals of the kingdom. But, even under David and Solomon, the tribes were not so closely united, that such a history of the patriarchs could have been composed, unless earlier documents had been to hand. Its antiquity is also proved from the parallel period in Egyptian history. We must therefore go further back for the date of its composition. The discovery of ancient Epigraphy has enabled us to check the sacred books, by showing that they faithfully depicted the manners and customs of the times.[37] Such fidelity would be well-nigh impossible had they not been written at a very early period, almost contemporaneously with the events they describe. A certain section of the critical school make a similar concession in regard to the books of the covenant (Exodus xx-xxiv.), "Israel's most ancient codex," as Reuss calls it; and while Reuss ascribes it to Josaphat, Dillmann sets it down as not later than Samuel.

But, it may be asked, is not the traditional view contradicted by the clear testimonies of Holy Scripture itself? That there are difficulties of detail arrayed against it, no one will deny; but, on the other hand, any one who, with an unbiassed mind, weighs the evidence, will see that these difficulties are not half so great as those which the critics must encounter, who attempt to explain the history of Israel by the personality of Moses alone,—without the Law, and without divine guidance. The latter difficulty is one of principle, the former only one of detail. Let us begin by examining the two passages that may be regarded as the landmarks of the new hypothesis.

In the 22nd chapter of the Fourth Book of Kings it is related that the pious King Josias (640-609), ordered the Temple, neglected under Manasses, to be restored. "And "Helcias the high priest said to Saphan the scribe: I have "found the Book of the Law in the house of the Lord: and "Helcias gave the book to Saphan, and he read it. . . . And "Saphan the scribe told the king, saying: Helcias the priest

37 Vigouroux, iv. 3.

"hath delivered to me a book." Then the king ordered the Lord to be consulted for him, and for the people, and for all Juda, concerning the words of this book which is found: "for "the great wrath of the Lord is kindled against us, because "our fathers have not hearkened to the words of this book, to "do all that is written for us." The prophetess Holda being consulted, first foretells the punishment of the Lord on the disobedience of the people. But to the King of Juda she is bidden to say: "Thus saith the Lord the God of Israel: "Forasmuch as thou hast heard the words of the book, and "thy heart hath been moved to fear, and thou hast humbled "thyself before the Lord, hearing the words against this place, "and the inhabitants thereof. . . . I also have heard thee, "saith the Lord." Then the king read before the assembled people all the words of the book of the covenant which was found in the house of the Lord, and he made a covenant with the Lord, and the people agreed to be faithful to Him, and to the covenant. And the king commanded them to cast out of the temple all vessels that had been made for idols, and he banished idols from Jerusalem, and destroyed the soothsayers, and forbade sacrifice to be offered up on the high places. Then the king commanded all the people: "Keep the phase to "the Lord your God, according as it is written in the book of "this covenant. Now there was no such phase kept from the "days of the judges, who judged Israel, nor in all the days of "the kings of Israel, and of the kings of Juda."*

As the prophet Jeremias was exercising his office and declaiming vigorously against idolatry in the time of Josias, it is conjectured that he had a share, not only in the work of restoration effected by Josias, but also in the renewal of the covenant. The following passage in particular is quoted to show that the ceremonial law originated in his time: "For I "spoke not to your fathers, and I commanded them not, in "the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, con-

* IV. Kings XXIII. 22.

"cerning the matter of burnt offerings and sacrifices. But "this thing I commanded them saying: Hearken to my voice, "and I will be your God, and you shall be my people: and "walk ye in all the way, that I have commanded you, that it "may be well with you."*

A further proof of this new theory is derived from the disparaging judgments passed by other prophets on the sacrifices. While inveighing against the confusion of outward worship with inward religion, they acknowledge that in their time worship was carried out with great zeal and splendour, and was held in the highest esteem, but they trace it back not to Moses or Jahve, but simply to the belief that Jahve, like other gods, must be worshipped with sacrifice, gifts, and prayer. They make no mention of a command given by Jahve to offer these sacrifices. For Amos says: "Come ye to Bethel, and "do wickedly; to Galgal, and multiply transgressions; and "bring in the morning your victims, your tithes in three days: "for so ye would do, O children of Israel."* "I hate, I have "rejected your festivities; and I will not receive the odour of "your assemblies. And if you offer me holocausts, and your "gifts, I will not receive them: neither will I regard the vows "of your fat beasts. . . . Did you offer victims and sacrifices "to me in the desert for forty years, O house of Israel?" † In like manner Osee and Isaias[38] inveigh against the practice of sacrifice and the neglect of the Thorah, which would impart to them the knowledge of God, and lead them to a truly religious life. "Shall I offer holocausts to him, and calves of a year "old? . . . I will show thee, O man, what is good, and what "the Lord requireth of thee: verily to do judgment, and to "do mercy, and to walk solicitous with thy God."‖ One of the most important duties of the prophets, it would seem, was

* Jeremias VII. 22-23.

† Amos IV., 4.

‡ Amos V. 21.

‖ Micheas, vi. 6.

38 Osee iv. 6, seq.; viii. 11; Is. I. 10; II. 3; v. 24; viii. 16, 20; xxx. 9.

to separate religion from worship. "*God has no pleasure in sacrifices.*" (Os. vi., 6.)

Let us begin by taking an exact survey of the situation. That Israel was set free from the bondage of Egypt is allowed on all hands. For this the proofs are many and overwhelming. It is attested by Joel, Amos, Isaias, Osee, Micheas, Judges, and Samuel,[39] whose authority is beyond question. Again, six out of the fourteen oldest laws have reference to the Exodus.* Deborah's ancient canticle sings the glories of the departure from Sinai. † Turn where we will in the Bible, whether to its prose or poetry, to the historical or prophetical books, the Exodus and the Conquest stand forth as luminous facts. Most of its details are ingrained in popular belief. It is furthermore conceded that the people were led through the wilderness, and that God gave them a *Thorah*. For Moses appears throughout the Old Testament as the sole mediator of the Covenant,[40] and where there is question of a written law, no name save that of Moses is mentioned as its author. Again, it is admitted that gifts and sacrifices were offered to Jahve long before the Book of the Law was published by Josias. But what is denied is, that the march through the wilderness allowed time and opportunity for the Thorah to be fixed by writing; that the Thorah contained any regulations for worship; that the worship of God was limited to one central place. Both the historical and prophetical books bear witness, it is alleged, that sacrifices in the high places were lawful till the reign of Josias; all that was forbidden was to offer them to strange gods, as a reference to the history of Elias will shew. From Solomon to Josias, we are told, sanctuaries were erected in the high places, even in Jerusalem itself, to sundry strange gods. And as regards the priesthood, it was not chosen exclusively from the tribe of Levi,

* Exodus xv.; Numbers xv. 21; Deut. xxxi. 33; Josue x. 31

† Judges v. 4.

39 Compare *Annales de Philos. chrétienne*, Paris, 1887, p. 113 seq.

40 Josue iv. 14; xi. 20, Judges iii. 4; Kings xxi. 7: Micheas vi. 4, 5 I. Kings xii. 6, 8. See Haneberg, l.c., p. 188.

but each place, sometimes each house, had its own laws and priest. Such, for instance, were appointed to minister at the old Canaanite sanctuaries, which the Jews kept up. The priests of Jerusalem under David and Solomon were creatures of the Court, and figured side by side with the priests of the high places. Not till the reign of Josias were these deposed, and confined to Jerusalem. But there was as yet no distinction between priests and levites. The distinction arose only when the priests at Jerusalem refused to acknowledge the priests of the high places as their equals in rank, and tried to restrict them to the lower services of the temple. Thus the question about Deuteronomy is intimately connected with that of the sacerdotal codex. The two questions dovetail one into the other. We have thought it expedient to discuss the general points of contact first, and then show in what respects the two specifically differ.

To confront these theories with testimonies from the Books of Kings* is to no purpose, as the historical value of these books is itself in dispute. Still in common with the Books of Samuel, Josue and Judges, the Books of Kings (the authorship of which is often ascribed to Jeremias) start with the assumption that Israel's worship was instituted by Moses. At this point the critics scent an interpolation. A later compiler, they say, borrowing from Deuteronomy and the priestly codex, so re-arranged the historical books that, by an anachronism, a subsequent stage of development is shifted back to the beginning, and made the starting-point. Verily a violent hypothesis, especially when we bear in mind that the continuity of the historic records is thus broken, by a pre-conceived opinion and a mere hypothesis. And this in the teeth of the fact, that it is precisely the Fourth Book of Kings which has received signal confirmation from the inscription of Mesa (ninth century.) The agreement between the two documents as to events,

* That is, the III and IV. books of Kings. The Author quotes I. and II. Books as I and II Books of Samuel, which, as he has said above, are not called in question. Tr.

geographical data, and even the style of writing, is most striking.[41]

The hypothesis, however, fails to remove the main difficulty. For it is certain that an elaborate sacrificial ceremonial existed before Josias, and it neither is nor can be proved that he was the first to centralize the worship. We have no wish to underrate the efforts made by Hiskiah (Ezechias 727-698) in this direction. But divine worship received a permanent fixed form under David. In his last will he prescribed that the book of Moses should be honoured by the king as the fount of doctrine, morals, and law. And, although no great weight is nowadays attached to the Samaritan Pentateuch,[42] it takes for granted that a codex was even then in existence. Anyhow, the building of Solomon's temple gave such a mighty impulse to centralization, that Josias' enactment can only be regarded as a restoration, not an innovation. And if Solomon is represented as having been persuaded by his wives to espouse the cause of idolatry, does it follow that it is but a highly coloured account of the legality of worship in the high places? Even in III. Kings III. 2, nothing is chronicled beyond the bare fact that sacrifices were offered on the heights before the temple was built.

Still less trustworthy is the assertion that the sanctuaries at Bethel and Dan were recognized as legitimate, and that worship on the heights was then perfectly allowable. It is, indeed, quite true that the prophets, even Elias and Eliseus, seemed satisfied if the sacrifices were offered to Jahve; but the prophets were obliged to confine their efforts within the limits of practical possibility. Still they saw reason for strongly denouncing Juda's conduct and worship. Amos, Osee, and Isaias inveighed bitterly against the deeply-rooted practice of worshipping in the high places, which they regarded as most pernicious. But it by no means follows that it had ever been

41 Compare Smend and Socin, *Die Inschrift des Koenigs Mesa von Moabit.* Freiburg, 1886 *Controverse*, 1887, p 448 seq. Vigouroux v, 45 seq.

42 Haneberg, p 184, 190

legitimate. Does it follow from their denunciation of idolatry, or again, from their threatenings of God's punishment for the sins of the people, that these sins were previously permitted? On the attempts made by the Jerusalem priests to bring about centralization we can speak with less certainty, as they, unlike the prophets, have left no writings; but the building of the temple is itself conclusive proof that the current was gliding towards local union.

But this unity of worship may be traced still further back. It was already symbolized by the ark of the covenant in which Jahve abode. In war, this brought defeat to the Philistines, and victory to the Jews. The Philistines could not keep it in their possession. David, indeed, first lodged it for three months in Obededom's house; but his action was dictated, not by a superstitious motive engendered by the misfortunes that had just followed in its train, but by prudence and a calculating shrewdness. Some there are who, contrary to the common opinion, hold that the tabernacle was but a copy of the temple, and a mere device for projecting to the very beginning of history the unity of worship inaugurated with the building of the temple. Who, then, was the genius that conceived this masterly idea? What end had he in view? Was it, perchance, the outcome of the law of "natural development," according to which the whole Jewish religion is said to have grown and expanded? In that case the unpretentious tent should have been the forerunner of the magnificent temple. One fails to see how development could have been furthered by a mere abstraction, however wonderfully conceived and drawn down to the minutest details; or how it could have satisfied later needs and desires for dating the worship further back. Would it not be better to suppose that there existed in early times a sanctuary analogous to the temple? But this is impossible. Without the tabernacle, the sanctuary in Silo remains an enigma. The one natural and therefore sure explanation is that the tabernacle was both planned and executed at the time when the Israelites first became a people.

"According to all sound principles of criticism, the existence of the tabernacle in the days of Moses, which it is the fashion to brand as a fiction hatched after the captivity, is one of the most certain of facts, the denial of which would lead to most unnatural suppositions."[43] "Moreover, we should then expect the author's description to exhibit clearer evidence that he had the temple before his eyes, than is afforded by the very doubtful passages that are alleged."[44] Even Wellhausen is constrained to admit that the ark without the tent is older than, and suggested the idea and form of, the tabernacle. Furthermore, it is urged that in Leviticus xvii. the Israelites were commanded to do their slaughtering in front of the tabernacle, whereas Deuteronomy xii. left them free in this respect. From this it is argued that the command in Leviticus marks a reaction against the custom of domestic slaughtering which, as involving a domestic ritual and service, Deuteronomy supposes. Is it not far likelier that a distinction was subsequently drawn between the slaughtering and the sacrifice of victims? and that the slaughtering at home was permitted because it was found to be alike unnecessary and impossible both to slaughter and to sacrifice in the same place? The history of the Paschal lamb furnishes a parallel case. Here it was found necessary to allow the lamb to be slain privately. Sacrifices outside the temple were long considered as offered to demons. This view, far from being new, is precisely that taken by the later prophets before the captivity.

Lastly, if the contention is set up that Leviticus xvii. is part of a special legislation which, though at variance with itself in many respects, especially in the prohibition of profane slaughter, was incorporated in the sacerdotal codex, then the balance of probability wholly inclines to the priority of Leviticus. It is almost superfluous to say that we do not expect in Semitic historians and sacred writers

43 Orelli, in *Herzogs Real-Encyclop.*, vii., 173. Compare Delitzsch, *Pentateuch-Krit. Studien*, in *Zeitschr. für Kirchl. Wissenschaft*, 1880, p. 57 seq. Selbst, in *Katholik*, 1887, I., p. 474.

44 Riehm, *Bibl. Wörterbuch*, II., 1567. Compare Os. ix. 6. I. Kings ii. 22; IV. Kings viii. 4.

the precision and critical acumen required of historians in the 19th century. Semitic writers loved repetitions with variations; apparent contradictions would hardly strike them, and in the best of faith they would now and again insert additions from later sources, in order to explain and illustrate their story.[45]

In the days of the Judges we grant that the several tribes of Israel, as they were wanting in external organization, were not completely united. Nevertheless there were always some who bore about in their breasts the idea of the Covenant; who worshipped Jahve, united the scattered tribes against the common foe, and inspirited them for battle. Who would expect to find worship as neatly centralized in that stormy age as in later times? Nor, again, does the absence of perfect union prove the absence of a common religious legislation. The machinery of legislation could not be got into full working order before the country had been in great part conquered.

Even then it would have failed of its full effect had not the Jews been all along persuaded that the legislation had been given them by God Himself for their sojourn in Canaan. That a man Moses existed, is admitted as an undoubted fact even by the modern critical school, though his name is but seldom mentioned in the older documents.[46] For, they argue, there is no difficulty in understanding how his name and person were gradually brought home to the people, chiefly through the instrumentality of the prophets. But what is true of his person may also be applied to his work. "Those who continued a work, at once "so genial, so forcible, and so epoch-making, had no need "to disown its author, or to ignore his name. For to that "name a grateful tradition had linked every thing great "and useful that the power of one world-subduing idea "had accomplished and was still to accomplish in religion, "state and society."

45 Haneberg, p. 193, Kaulen, II, 164.

46 In Pre-deuteronomical time only. Mich. vi. 4. Compare, Judges I. 16. 20; III. 4; iv. ii. I. Kings xii. 6. 8. Reuss, p. 69.

For this reason, the narrative in the Book of Kings, concerning the legislation of Josias, might, at first blush, cause some surprise. But it will seem less strange, when we bear in mind that forty years of idolatry under Manasses preceded the reign of Josias. In such a lengthened period the book of the Law, heretofore preserved in the temple* but accessible only to the priests, might easily have been forgotten. The books of Moses were never intended for the people; they were entrusted to the clergy, to be used by them as evidence against the sins of the people. The people were enjoined to *hear*, not to *read* them; and if they had not been read aloud for many years, the memory of them, in a later generation, would be but faint and dim. And yet, even then, the people must have known that they existed. Otherwise Josias would have been obliged to appeal to a book, not recently discovered, but given there and then by God. In either case his assertion, unless backed up by further proof, would have found little credence. The more Josias interfered with existing religious rites, especially as regards worship on the high places, the more violent would have been the torrent of opposition, and a mere forgery would have been swallowed up in the angry flood. The reference to the law written in the heart,† is not meant to indicate its origin, but the ease with which it can be fulfilled.

The hypothesis of a "pious fraud" is still less admissible, when the prophet Jeremias' name is closely associated therewith. The event happened at a time when he had received his prophetic mission. He was connected with those who took part in the promulgation, and he pledged his authority for the Pentateuch as the law-book which God gave through Moses. What he, in common with other prophets, says about the sacrifices of the time, by no means implies that Moses gave no orders whatever for sacrifice. On the contrary, Jeremias is, in a manner, the connecting link between the reforms of Josias, and those

* Deut. xxxi. 24.

† Ibid xxx. 11—14.

instituted by Hiskiah (Ezechias).[47] "If," as Pascal says, "the "law and the sacrifices are the truth, they will necessarily please "and not displease God. If they are figures, they must both "please and displease Him; and this is the case throughout "Holy Scripture. Therefore they are figures."[48] In the light of this distinction, the discourses, otherwise self-contradictory and self-stultifying, are made luminous. Religion threatened to degenerate daily more and more into formalism. And as the people so often fell a prey to idolatry, the prophets had of necessity to shoot their arrows chiefly at the outward worship, which was but the means to an end. Thus they hoped to give prominence again to the religious and moral side of the Law. Hence it came to pass that the Thorah, which contains the manifestation of God's will, and the rule of life, was with them a matter of life and death. As long as the spirit of God was still in Israel, ever impelling the prophets to proclaim aloud His chastisements, oral direction seemed in their eyes far more important than a reference to the letter of the law. The "organs" of oral instruction (Thorah*), which even Wellhausen must admit to have existed in the earliest times, were also indispensable for the written Thorah.

Again, it is, to say the least, very probable that the Exodus and the legislation on Sinai[49] are the nucleus of the book of Osee the chief scope of which is to threaten the people with the punishments hanging over their heads for having fallen away from the Law. Osee is not merely familiar with the contents of the Pentateuch, but he and it agree in certain characteristic expressions. Until, therefore, the Pentateuch is proved to be dependent on the prophets, the traditional view must remain in possession—that the prophets, despite their con-

47 Compare III Kings xv. 12 seq. xxii. 1 seq. *Katholik* 1887, i. 472. Haneberg, p. 184

48 *Pensées* xiii, 2.

49 II. 4. 10; iv. 6; ix 10. 15, xi. 1; xii, 10; xiii: 4. 5. Compare Scholz, *Commentar zum Buche Hoseas*, Würzburg 1882, p. xxi. and 108. *Katholik*, p. 458

* The Hebrew word "Thorah," derived, according to Gesenius from *Jarah*, jacere, βάλλεσθαι and in Hiphil instituere, docere, originally meant oral instruction, teaching. The "Sepher Thorah" is the book containing the instructions. Tr.

demnations of sacrifice, were acquainted with the text of the Law. They refer to the Law as something well known, and even as written.* To construe the prophet's appeal to the written Thorah as meaning "the words of my instruction" is to give an arbitrary twist to the words, and to wrench them violently from the context. *Missa* (*Massa?*) not *Thorah* is the name given to a prophetic utterance.† Even if we suppose that the passages quoted from Isaias‡ are prophetic and not sacerdotal instructions, they only prove that the spirit of the Thorah stands on a higher altitude than external worship,[50] not that the sacerdotal codex is irreconcilable with the Thorah of i. 10. Nor does *Michæas* exclude sacrifices from the Thorah; rather he insists that they are not the chief, or the only thing. Wellhausen rejects the clear traces of the Pentateuch in the most ancient prophetic books with the simple remark: "These passages will make no impression on any one who is convinced that PC is the more recent of the two!" Truly a most convenient mode of procedure! And yet the faintest signs of later composition are expected to make a telling impression on defenders of the Pentateuch!

And now the way is somewhat cleared for an explanation of the passage in Jeremias. According to Exodus xix.—xxiv., the decalogue was promulgated, and accepted by the people, on Mount Sinai (xxiv. 3). Then followed the promulgation of the order of divine service. Thus not sacrifice, but the moral law holds the first and chief place in the legislation. The scope of an author must always be taken into account, and in this case it is unmistakable. S. Paul's utterances on the Law may, without strain, be drawn out in a perfect parallel. Again, his words in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, on the relations that subsist between the gifts and the theological virtues, charity above all, form an instructive

50 Knabenbauer, *Erklärung des Proph. Isaias*, Freiburg, 1881, p. 49 seq.

* Osee VIII. 12.

† Ibid. viii. 10.

‡ Is. i. 10. II. 3; v. 24; viii. 16. 20; xxx. 9.

analogy. If this suggestion be demurred to, there still remains the alternative of narrowing the "day of the Exodus" to the events related in Exodus iv. 30. 31, and xix. 5, where the whole people promised, as they were bidden, to obey Jahve.[51] There is no gainsaying the fact that the actual institution of sacrifice goes back to the days of Moses. The theory, that sacrificial worship rested on tradition alone, is beset with as many difficulties as the opposite theory that it rested on written legislation.

In like manner, the fact of the priests of the high places being put on an equal footing with the Jerusalem priests is no proof that the distinction between priests and levites was a later creation. If priests are often called levites, their superiority to levites in the strict sense, though not emphasized, is not thereby denied. For the chief object in view, was to remind the laity of their duty to the clergy, and this purpose was best served by giving the whole hierarchy one common name. In any case, when the temple was built, provision had to be made for the lower offices. The priests of the high places being of the tribe of Levi, ranked as priests when transferred to Jerusalem. On the death of Josias they did not return to the high places, but amalgamated with the Jerusalem priests in a national priestly tribe of Levi. Such an intrusion would have been resisted, had not birth given a prescriptive right thereto.[52] The name Levi also occurs in Genesis xxxiv;* not, be it noted, as a name of office, but as a tribal or proper name. Now, since Wellhausen traces the leading features in the history of the patriarchs to the land of Ephraim, he is bound in consistency to explain Levi in the above passage to mean the tribe of Levi. Therefore the levites are prior to Josias. The priest of Ephraim, mentioned in Judges xvii. 13, proves nothing to the contrary, for, as the tribe of Levi was scattered all over the

51 Scholz, *Jeremias*, p. 113.
52 Naumann, p. 39. Haneberg, p. 199.
* See xlix. 5.

country, there is nothing unlikely in his statement that he belonged to that tribe. Anyhow, the tribe of Levi is thus shewn to be one of the oldest. Of this tribe were Moses and Aaron; and in the time of the Judges some priests were levites.* Hence there is no *prima facie* improbability in the custom, in vogue among other nations, of one special tribe or family inheriting the right to perform public acts of worship. The "popular idea that Moses chose the tribe of Levi may "bristle with difficulties. Maybe also it is not transparently "clear. Nay it may even be granted that the original motive "in setting it apart, and its first fortunes in connection there- "with are, and perhaps always will be, shrouded in obscurity."[53] The violent encroachments of kings could not tamper with the institution as such. Distinct cities could not, indeed, have been actually set apart for priests and levites before the conquest of the country; this, however, does not preclude a previous plan of settlement.

From the foregoing pages it is clear that the sacerdotal code, that is the Mosaic ritualistic legislation properly so-called, must be more ancient than Deuteronomy. For Deuteronomy is based on it, and takes it for granted; and if, in parts, it is more concise, more definite, and more detailed, it need not therefore be later than Deuteronomy. This would only show that Deuteronomy is an adaptation to the circumstances immediately antecedent to the entrance into the promised land.[54] This explanation should surely commend itself to those who relegate Deuteronomy to the days of Josias; but it is likewise quite consistent with Mosaic authorship, provided that the forty years sojourn in the wilderness, which critics, who scoff at the idea of God guiding and protecting the people, reject on general and insufficient grounds, be maintained intact; and that Deuteronomy be assigned to the latter end of this period. Here and there,

53 Reuss, p 63, 80

54 Haneberg, p. 187 Compare v. gr. Levit. xvii. 3—9 with Deut. xi. 31 seq; xii. 2—6; xiii—xvi.

* Compare I Kings, ii. 27; vi. 4.

doubtless, the finger of a later writer is discernible. Thus, for instance, many enactments made in Leviticus for the sojourn in the wilderness, *e.g.*, sacrifices in front of the tabernacle, are repealed in Deuteronomy, as a precaution against idolatry. In Canaan it was found necessary to forbid sacrifices on the high places. The command in Deuteronomy to offer sacrifices in the place that the Lord shall choose, is not to be taken in an exclusive sense, as, for special reasons, sacrifice might be offered elsewhere. Prophets and priests (Heliopolis) were not unacquainted with dispensations from the law.[55]

In like manner in the hypothesis concerning P, we find the key-note in one single passage of the Old Testament. In the eighth chapter of Nehemias (Esdras II.) we read that all the people were gathered together as one man to the street which is before the water-gate, and they spoke to Esdras the scribe, to bring the book of the law of Moses which the Lord had commanded to Israel. Then Esdras the priest brought the law before the multitude of men and women, and read it plainly and distinctly. And all the people wept, when they heard the words of the law. And on the second day the chiefs of the families of all the people, the priests and the levites were gathered together to Esdras the scribe, that he should interpret to them the words of the law. And they found written in the law, that the law had commanded by the hand of Moses, that the children of Israel should dwell in tabernacles on the feast, in the seventh month. And they did accordingly. Again the ninth chapter contains an epitome of sacred history, which concludes with the words: "And because of all this "we ourselves make a covenant, and write it, and our "princes, our levites, and our priests sign it."

Does not this detailed history of the legislation of Esdras leave the impression that the Mosaic law, and the observance of feasts and religious rites, were then promulgated for the first time? From the earliest times Jews and Christians have

55 Vigouroux, *Controverse*, 1887. Juillet, p. 321 seq.

argued therefrom that Esdras, was inspired to compose anew the law that had been buried in the ruins of their city. Hence the school of Antioch credited him with *Theopneustia.*[56] The Jews, on the other hand, thought him inspired in all his own writings, as well as in regard to the twenty-four Canonical Scriptures. But the impression thus created is only transient. A close examination of the historical circumstances warns us to seek elsewhere a key to the narrative. Till now it had not been possible to weld into one community the remnant that returned from captivity and the Jews that had remained at home, or to restore the regular order of divine service. What then, if the chronicler, in the exuberance of his joy, extolled as a new creation the restoration brought to a happy issue by Esdras and Nehemias? What, if the people shed tears of joy and sorrow, on seeing a peaceful revival of old memories? It cannot surely be argued that the people had therefore never heard the law before, because in that case a long gradual preparation would have been necessary. For a people, that had experienced the hardships of exile, could not be expected to be enthusiastic in accepting radical changes on the strength of the highest authority in Israel, to wit Moses, without enquiring into the genuineness of the appeal. That same people, described in the Old Testament as rough, sensual and stiffnecked, whose trust in Jahve had hardly saved them from annihilation, would not have allowed to be thrust on them an exalted and pure religion that rigorously enjoined holiness in life and trust in Jahve. Much less would they have submitted to a law that laid so heavy a yoke on them. Finally, how comes it, that all the Jews, scattered as they were over the whole land and over foreign countries too, were induced to accept it? If Wellhausen[57] is at liberty to think that the establishment of the Mosaic theocracy after the captivity, was due to an "ever memorable energy," we are surely within our right in conceiving that energy to have emanated from the renewal of an ancient

56 Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus.* Freiburg 1880. p. 80.

57 *Prolegomena*, p. 441.

and venerable Covenant. It was the energy of faith, and of an unquenchable hope. But for the belief in an ancient legislation, Esdras and Nehemias could never have succeeded in their most difficult and most important task of bringing the Jewish community[58] to receive the Pentateuch as their code of laws. A clumsy forgery would lack the prestige of antiquity, and fail to curb and bridle "the heart's wild desires." The Jewish scribes might give the old law a new status; they could not have invented a new law.[59]

The critics, indeed, assume a sort of preparation during the Captivity, and make Ezechiel figure as the pioneer of the new movement. To him they also ascribe the so-called law of holiness.* Chapters xl-xlviii. of Ezechiel, they say, give the clue to the Old Testament. But they thereby concede that the solemn change under Esdras in 444 was not, strictly speaking, an innovation. Rather it gave a full and final sanction to a previously existing practice, with a view to rendering the Jewish religion impregnable against all the assaults of a corrupt heathenism. The chapters in Ezechiel supply no clue whatever to the formation of P. On the contrary, both Ezechiel and the later prophets take for granted that Moses formed the entire law. To overthrow a tradition, strongly entrenched behind the prescriptive rights of centuries, the new theory needs to be armed to the teeth with unassailable proofs.

Wellhausen strives to fortify his position with the following arguments: 1—*The Place of Worship.* The historical and prophetical books make no mention of one Hebrew sanctuary in ancient times, to the exclusion of all others. The Jehovist (JE) sanctions a plurality of altars; while Deuteronomy (D) exacts local unity in divine worship, and the priestly code (P) taking this unity for granted, makes it date back, by means of the ark of the covenant, to primitive times.

58 P. 169. Fritz., p. 188.

59 Ryssel, *Die Anfänge der jüdischen Schriftgelehrsamkiet, in Studien u. Kritik.* 1887 No. I.

* Levit. xvii-xxvi.

2—*Sacrifices.* According to P, ceremonial is the chief object of the Mosaic legislation, but according to JE it is pre-Mosaic. P mainly considers *how* worship was to be performed, while JE and D emphasize to *whom* it is to be offered. JE is backed by the historical books, but all the prophets down to Ezechiel are arrayed against P. Moreover, P discloses a tendency to introduce a material and spiritual refinement in the gifts offered. The meal offering makes way for the holocaust; Jerusalem becomes the centre of worship, and sacrifices are withdrawn from the scene of rural life.

3—*Festivals.* JE and D ring the changes on a trio of feasts: Easter, Pentecost, Tabernacles. The feasts are regulated by the first-fruits from flock and field. In the historical and prophetical books the harvest festival is the only one clearly and distinctly mentioned. In JE and D it is likewise the most important. But in P the feasts undergo an essential change, since they no longer have reference to the harvest and first-fruits. This change was owing to the centralization of worship, and its origin may be traced through Deuteronomy and Ezechiel to P. The great day of expiation, originating in the fast-days of the captivity, is added.

4—*Priests and Levites.* According to Ezechiel xliv. none but the levites of Jerusalem, the sons of Sadoc, are to be priests in the new Jerusalem, the other levites being degraded to the rank of servants. In the same way, according to P, the priestly dignity was confined to the sons of Aaron, that is the sons of Sadoc, to the absolute exclusion of all levites. But in the earliest period of Israelitic history, the distinction between clergy and laity was unknown. Anyone who pleased might slaughter and offer sacrifice. Official priests were found in none but the greater sanctuaries. In the oldest part of JE priests are not mentioned. In D the levites are priests. Except in Judges xviii seq., priests as such make their first appearance in the literature of the captivity.

5—*The Endowment of the Clergy.* The sacrificial dues are

levied at a higher rate in P, and the first-fruits, now transformed into donations to the priests, are doubled. Cities, specially set apart for levites, are now mentioned.

In the second paragraph of his work Wellhausen deals with the "History of Tradition," and tries to show that it lends support to the hypothesis which an analysis of the law had suggested. He confesses, however, that the chief argument lies in the first paragraph. The history of Tradition, he says, begins with the Books of Chronicles, which were a deliberate and studied attempt to model the historical books of the Old Testament according to the religious bias of P. The author of Chronicles names, besides the old historical books, certain other independent sources from which he drew. Wellhausen, instead of crediting him with these, calmly sets down all discrepancies as part and parcel of a system of misrepresentation which these were designed to further. On what ground are these wholesale clearances effected? If an author directs his attention mainly to religious history, and views history more under this aspect than authors who had gone before, does it follow that he must be swayed by a spirit of misrepresentation? The later the time of the composition of Chronicles, the more difficult this supposition becomes, because the eyes of all would have been fixed on the writer. The very tenacity, with which the Jews clung to the law, would prevent such a reconstruction of history on an entirely fictitious basis, unless their ancient history, except under this particular aspect, was not generally known to them. This is, indeed, the case, as is abundantly shown from Josue downwards, and by nothing so clearly as the fact, above indicated, that critics persist in declaring all the books to be interpolated. Whatever tells in favour of an earlier existence of P is necessarily a later addition brought about by P. If this were so, is it not amazing that these authors, bent on remodelling, and with misrepresentation ever in view, should have adopted only one verbal quotation from the Thorah (IV. Kings, xvi., 6=Deut. xxiv., 16), whereas the influence of Deuteronomy is

perceptible on every page? Had they in sober earnest been bent on proving that the legislation contained in the new P was really old, they would have brought the Thorah more into requisition. The greater frequency with which the older books refer to D, and the steadiness with which they keep it in view, is accounted for by the fact, already mentioned, that Deuteronomy adapted the law given in the wilderness to the new set of circumstances in Canaan. The restoration under Josias gave the finishing stroke to the work of adaptation. Not until this restoration had been accomplished, could the law, in its fulness and entirety, be urged so strongly as it is urged in the Books of Chronicles. The restoration under Esdras had this very object in view. This distinction, it must be added, is not strictly applicable either to the more ancient or the more modern books. Wellhausen himself is constrained to admit that, though a recension on the lines of the Deuteronomical law was clearly made, the authors at times had older documents to hand.[60]

It is next suggested that all changes, which new compilers introduced, may be detected by being subjected to one test: they do violence to the traditional matter. And will this subjective opinion constitute a valid test for discriminating the true elements from the false in Semitic history? This is impossible, especially if "sacred history be considered no more "than an extra coat of paint daubed on the original picture;" for to detect the separate colours that enter as ingredients into this universal picture would defy the skill of man. If all these books bear a uniform stamp derived from the history of tradition, and if, moreover, the Books of Samuel and Kings show that the prophets were the real source of religious influence, it cannot surely be erroneous to say that the prophets had a great deal to do with a written history of Israel. But if this much be admitted, the alleged composition of the historical books after the captivity is shown to be unfounded, and the

60 *Prolegomena*, p. 393.

books must be set down to the time of the prophets, whose spirit they breathe. The prophets appeal again and again to the guiding-hand of God, so manifest in Israel's past history; they paint the future on the past. With these facts before us we may rest assured that they not only breathed their own spirit into tradition, but they carried their solicitude so far as to commit the whole to writing. How could they have come forward as the champions of God's law (Thorah), if a written Thorah had not been in existence?

There are some, we are aware, who do not regard Assyriology and Egyptology with favour, and who demur to all reference to these studies. But, in view of the root-and-branch rejection of Chronicles, we cannot refrain from noticing a modern archæological discovery. In 1828 Champollion found, among the ruins of Karnak, a wall on which was an inscription recording the grand deeds of Sesak, and within the inscription the likeness of a Jewish King, who was no other than Roboam, son of Solomon. Thus, on Egyptian soil, Champollion found confirmation of the story told in the twelfth chapter of Chronicles. This discovery caused Cardinal Wiseman to say: No monument hitherto brought to light has afforded such a new and convincing argument for the genuineness of Holy Scripture. Origen, in writing against Celsus, had said that evidence of the long wars waged betweeen the Jews and Assyrians was forthcoming from writers on both sides. The statement has received more striking confirmation from the most recent explorations than Origen ever dreamed of. Names and dates, heretofore found nowhere but in Holy Scripture, and consequently called in question, have been unearthed. Thus Assyriology, not to mention other services, has helped to save the honour and reputation of the Books of Kings and Chronicles.[61] What Assyriology tells us about Assurbanipal confirms, strikingly though indirectly, the narrative in the Second Book of Chronicles of the transportation of Manasses to Babylon, and his restoration to his throne in

61 Origenes c. Cels. I. 14. Vigouroux, iv, 22. 242. Reuss, p. 231.

Jerusalem. As even Reuss allows, the narratives in Chronicles very often bear the stamp of genuineness. Is it only the religious history in Chronicles that bears a thoroughly ungenuine stamp?

As the new hypothesis avowedly derives very little support from the History of Tradition, we may also infer that the special objections, urged against the antiquity of P, cannot be historically established. There is far too much flirting with conjectures, probabilities, and possibilities. In a period extending over three or four thousand years, and rife with ever-varying opinions and views of the world and history, mere general considerations, as the reader need hardly be reminded, are only of secondary importance. Apart from revelation, we cannot estimate the probabilities as to what Moses might, could or would command in the wilderness. Of this the later Old Testament writers, who stood midway between tradition and history, were the only competent judges. Moses legislated more for the future than for the present. Hence time was needed before many ordinances could take full effect. The exact description of the size and appointments of the camp of the Israelites, and the regulation of sacrificial worship down to the minutest details, were not without significance for the future. Anyhow, no argument can be drawn from them to show that this great nomadic people were always encamped on the same spot.

Prescriptions as to ritual were absolutely necessary. No ancient Semitic tribe was without a cultus. Moses would have been unable to keep his people apart,[62] if he had not regulated divine worship. Circumcision is older than Moses. It was even obligatory on Egyptian priests. After falling into disuse, it was renewed as a sign of the Covenant; for, henceforward, the whole people was to be a holy priesthood. The Egyptians were also familiar with the distinction between things *clean* and *unclean*, and all that appertained thereunto. Thus the law of holiness,

62 Reuss, p. 80.

which appears as a dominant ideal[63] in Ezechiel, Leviticus (xvii.—xxiv.), and P, is in great measure explained. The idea of sanctity lies at the root of the ancient Egyptian religion. The ancient Egyptian ritual, the sacerdotal purifications, the libations, the burning of victims, the white vestments of the priests, circumcision, and above all the ritual of the dead,[64] are built up on this foundation. Purity of body symbolized purity of soul. These prescriptions in P must therefore date back to a high antiquity. In the Sinaitic book of the Covenant, sanctity is coupled with the prohibition to eat unclean foods.* It was, therefore, necessary to issue new ordinances for slaughterings, for sacrifices, and for the levites. The two sides of holiness, the negative and the positive, must correspond. The positive side found expression in the whole life, especially in the cultus, of the nation. "Be ye holy, as your God is holy," is a command found not only in P, but in Jahve's Covenant with His people. The people are a priestly people, holding intercourse with God through Moses and the priesthood. Sanitary reasons also rendered its minute observance in the wilderness absolutely necessary. The distinction between clergy and laity, priests and levites is also perfectly intelligible. For, on the one hand, the exodus was undertaken for a religious end, and, on the other, Moses was wholly engrossed with his duties as civil governor and leader in war. In Egypt the priesthood was a specially organized body. Is it not, then, extremely probable that Moses created a similar organization?

The proof which our adversaries gather from the feasts is the very slender *argumentum ex silentio*. Originally, it is true, the feasts referred to agriculture, and were instituted in thanksgiving for the harvest, and other joyful events. But what place had agriculture in the wilderness? To what purpose, then, were the feasts? Of what use was the Sabbath as a

63 Wellhausen, p. 441.

64 Naumann, p. 60.

* Exod. xxii., 30.

day of rest? The Jews had been sojourning four hundred years in the corn lands of Egypt, and were thoroughly conversant with the mysteries of agriculture. But, as they were to enter into a land admirably suited for agricultural purposes, the feasts instituted in the wilderness by Moses, to be observed in the Promised Land, had reference to agriculture. A reference to Jahve's leadership was also necessitated by the history of the exodus. Naturally, in the beginning, the feasts were not generally observed in Canaan, and the reason is plain. Their historical and religious importance was not fully appreciated till the building of the temple gave an impetus and a common centre to the worship of Israel. Unwarrantable conclusions as to the age of the feasts have been drawn from the passages quoted above in reference to the solemnization of the Pasch under Josias, and of the feast of tabernacles under Esdras. An extraordinary festival on a special occasion supposes rather than excludes an ordinary festival. As regards the feast of the Passover, including the feast of unleavened bread (Mazzoth), it may be laid down as certain, that "all extant sources, even those "which critics pronounce the oldest, make definite and express "reference to the deliverance from Egypt; nay more, the various "special customs in use date from the exodus. Otherwise, the "very name Pasch (passover, spare), would be inexplicable. "Again, the order to sanctify the first-born was issued "in connection with the exodus,* but was wholly dis-"connected from the Paschal lamb, which holds an unique "position. In like manner the Jahvist and Deuteronomist never "class the unleavened bread among the first fruits,† but des-"cribe it, in remembrance of the Egyptian bondage, as the "bread of affliction."[65] Pentecost, on the other hand, continued to be the harvest festival; its significance, as a commemoration of the giving of the law on Sinai, dates from Christian times.

65 Orelli, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* 226. Compare *Katholik* 1887, I. 563.

* Exodus xiii. 1, xxxiv. 18.

† Ibid. xxiii. 19

Osee* gives the palm, in point of antiquity, to the feast of Tabernacles, as the harvest festival, and as commemorating the march through the Desert. As to the feast of Trumpets, and the day of Atonement, there was no need to mention them in Deuteronomy, because they had no reference to the congregation assembled before the sanctuary.[66] Lastly, the Sabbath, as stated in another place, existed long before Moses. Shepherds, indeed, may have known nothing of the Sabbath in the sense of religious rest, yet they may have originated it for astronomical reasons.[67] Therefore, its institution in the wilderness is not impossible; but its strict observance was possible only in the camp.

Concerning the Scriptures little more need be said. The fundamental proposition on which critics and philosophers love to dwell, namely, that sacrifice arose from the custom of common meals, is historically untenable.[68] Sacrifice was offered to appease and win the Deity; and was therefore a meal for the gods. Consequently, the fact that in P the religious idea pushes the idea of the meal into the background, does not demonstrate its later origin. So again, when we read in IV. Kings XII. 16 (17), and in Osee IV. 8 of "the money for trespass and the money for sins," this manner of speaking implies that there were two kinds of sacrifice, and both generally known.†

Now let us, for argument's sake, assume the hypothesis that P in its entirety, in contradistinction to the book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy, is to be described as desert legislation. Suppose, that is, that it makes no account of the real conditions and motives of actual life in Canaan, and that it builds up a sacred hierarchy, with the bold statutes of absolutism as its corner-stone[69] on the *tabula rasa* of the desert.

66 Vigouroux, *Controverse*, 1887. Juillet, p. 341. Broglie, *Annales de Phil. chret.* 1887, p. 120.

67 Reuss, p. 81.

68 Saussaye, p. 102.

69 Wellhausen, p. 105.

* xii. 10.

† See I. Kings vi. 3; iv. 8. Isaias liii. 10.

Suppose, moreover, that this legislation was given in Canaan, the scene of the history of this agricultural people, where they were peacefully spending their lives in agricultural pursuits. Finally, imagine that some one in the year 444 successfully attempted to frame the entire legislation of Israel on the mere fiction of a legislation in the wilderness. Now we ask, is it not more likely that Moses formulated the laws in the desert, with a view to the promised land for which they were destined? Must we not rather suppose that the above view of feasts and sacrifices, this distinction between nature and worship is defective and falls short of its aim? For, if feasts and sacrifices were ever devoid of religious significance, such a legislation would have been as impossible in the days of Esdras as in the days of Moses.

Furthermore, how was it possible so to dovetail different groups of writings into one another, that they should be universally reputed *one ancient* work? No ancient saga, remarks Wellhausen,[70] is so closely connected as the Bible. This close connection is, in the main, common to all the sources. The Jahvist and P run throughout on parallel historical lines, otherwise the two could never have been blended in one as in the the Pentateuch. The plan of the two documents is almost identical. But we no sooner infer from this admission that a subsequent compilation is all the more inconceivable, than we are met by the reply: The agreement of the sources in plan is hard to understand; nay, it is surprisingly remarkable. In fact nothing but literary dependence of one upon the other can account for it. And yet, a moment ago, these sources or rather the Hebrew story was extolled for being so closely connected! Where then are the joints? Nowhere, it is allowed, is religion applied as a motive power to justice and morality with such purity and force as among the Israelites. The corner-stone of their historical development, from first to last, is the theocratic principle. Jahve is the one God in the whole Bible, from

70 Page 308.

Genesis to Machabees. It is further admitted that the history of creation is nowhere given so clearly as in P; that the story of the creation of man, of Paradise, the Fall, and so forth, as told in the Jahvistic or older service, contains, under a simple form, a philosophy that is at once the noblest and most beautiful of its kind."[71] Both documents are, in their way, unsurpassed in grandeur, and in lofty conception. They leave all other religions far behind. Both profess to be an ancient revelation; an l neither can be conceived as anything else. Where would the fictitious compiler have acquired his skill?[72] Different sources may underlie the narrative. But the splendid harmony between the parts proves that they were originally made for each other, and not subsequently fitted together by literary skill. In many passages, too, the grandeur is coupled with singular precision of details. The similarity of names and numbers, the minute technicalities, the graphic description of scenery during camp life, constitute, even with the critical school, the real tests of authenticity. These signs cannot be dismissed as the product of imagination. For Jewish fancy, in later times, busied itself, not with painting or moulding, but with constructing and calculating. Anyhow, such documents must have been the outcome of the same traditional stock, at times more diffuse, at times more concise, but certainly never arranged for this special purpose. Wellhausen is bound to produce proof positive for his position. The more he deprecates an appeal to the *argumentum ex silentio*, the less can the apologist afford to dispense with it, when there is question of a fundamental proof. It would certainly be the height of unreason to demand positive evidence for a fact that never occurred; but we are undoubtedly within our right in holding fast to the view, upheld by the tradition of 3,000 years, until the opposite view is conclusively established with positive proof. Here is no question of theory, but of hard facts of life and

71 Reuss, p. 257.

72 Compare Welte, *Nachmosaisches*, 1840, p. 97. *Katholik*, 1887, 1. No. 4-5. Weiss, *Moses und sein Volk*, Freiburg, 1885. Vigouroux, 11.

history, and of explaining the entire history of revelation preparatory to redemption. In Wellhausen's words:[73] "Very "weighty reasons are needed to weaken the probability, which "rests on very positive testimony, that the Mosaic ritual was "codified after the captivity." We also are entitled to demand reasons, quite as weighty, to say the least, for the complete overthrow of the Old Testament as it exists in actual history.

It may have already occurred to the reader to ask, whether our view of history derives any support from, or can be justified by, a critical and comparative examination of the language. Is not the colouring in the language a sign that P was composed after the Captivity? Here, indeed, we meet with a strange, though interesting phenomenon. Distinguished scholars like Riehm, Delitzsch, Dillmann and others, precisely urge this argument *against* the Graf-Wellhausen theory. And what has Wellhausen to urge in reply? Very little, amazingly little, especially when we consider what an immense influence the Captivity brought to bear on Jewish modes of thought and writing, notwithstanding the conservative character of the Hebrew language, which remained substantially the same from Moses to Esdras.[74] The language in which P is couched, he says, has recently been put forward as a bulwark that is proof against all the assaults of destructive criticism. Unfortunately, he continues, the veto of language is as little backed up by proofs as the veto of critical analysis, and a contention, he scornfully adds, unsupported by argument, needs no reply. A solution, in truth, at once facile and brilliant! an admirable and expeditious method of shirking the real question at issue! He condescends, however, to offer a few "remarks at random." The language of the Jahvistic document, he says, is "in the main" clearly akin to that of the pre-captivity period, but the language of P is "quite foreign." At the same time he cannot deny that this is capable of explanation even if P were

73 Page 247.
74 Hamberg, p. 200

more ancient. This explanation is, in fact, most natural, considering that classical religious writings are wont to exert an immense influence on literature in general. The Koran is an instance in point. Wellhausen[75] himself, modestly enough, does not attach much force to his few remarks on this point. Linguistic science, he says, as far as Hebrew is concerned, is still in its infancy. Moreover, he insists that the tendency to re-model and re-edit the Scriptures was almost universal. Next he urges that the caprice of writers (e.g., *ani* and *anoki*) has so disturbed the original state of language, that in this case lexicons are of little use, and furnish only approximate data. From these admissions the uninitiated will rightly infer that linguistic studies are not favourable to the school of destructive criticism. Certain words, which would seem proper to inhabitants of Canaan,[76] are more archæological than philological, and may be considered as glosses. Anyhow, passages are not wanting which betray an acquaintance with the ground-work of the Pentateuch. "And they do not depreciate in value "because they fail to impress men who are already convinced "that the groundwork is more recent."[77]

As no Hebrew literature, except the Old Testament, has come down to us from pre-christian times, comparison is impossible. We are, however, not without non-Jewish writings. In the front rank stands the inscription of Mesa, to which reference has already been made. "In comparison with the "books of Judges and Samuel, with the poetical and older "prophetical books, the text of this inscription seems more "recent in point of language. Hence we may rightly conclude "that the language of these books has remained unchanged "since the days of the early kings. Similarly, if it be com-"pared with the books of Moses and Josue, these latter will be "seen to retain certain archaic peculiarities which are signs of

75 Page 408.
76 Reuss, p. 53. Haneberg, p. 292.
77 Baethgen, l.c.

"an older form of language. Thus their text, in part at least, "has remained intact for a much longer period."[78] Then, again, from ancient Phœnician inscriptions it is quite clear that the later books of the Old Testament, Ezechiel, Daniel, Chronicles, Esdras, Nehemias, and Esther, are considerably anterior to the third century B.C. For the oldest of these inscriptions, from the beginning of the third century onwards, exhibit such a degenerate style of writing that, however great the influence we allow to a sacred language, these books, even as worded in modern editions, must be far more ancient. Now we are in a position to appreciate the generous advice[79] not to lay stress on the argument from philology and literature, as these supply equally weighty arguments for both sides, but to take our stand on the history and ideas of religion. For here, to be sure, we are on the favourite platform of modern religious historians of the evolutionary school.

And now the apologist's task, in theology and exegesis and the history of religion, is finished. Further details belong to special exegesis. We have shown that the hypothesis which is spreading its roots far and wide, and which, as the works of Delitzsch, Dillmann, Kahues, Kurtz and Klostermann shew has already penetrated deep down into the strata of positive theology, is still far from being proved to the hilt; and it never can be so proved. Even Wellhausen confesses that it is only an "historical probability," beyond which there is a veil that no man can tear down. Kayser and Reuss acknowledge that many theologians of the critical school are persistently challenging what are set forth as the latest results. On the age of P most sound critics disagree with Graf and Wellhausen. The following words written by Reuss, the grandfather of the radical hypothesis, show that a word of caution is more than justified: "Amid the chaos of opinions, and the whirl of hypotheses, "which spasmodically rise to the surface and again sink under

78 Kaulen, *Einleitung*, 2 Ed., I., 47.

79 Stade, *Theol. Lit. Zeitung*, 1887 No. 9

" water, from out the heap of decisive denials and indeci- " sive assertions piled up in ordinary 'Introductions,' it is " exceedingly difficult to say what net gain has accrued to " historical research from the lucubrations of even the " weightiest critics." Dillmann, who casts the Hexateuch overboard, thus candidly speaks out: " When critics rise " to a higher level than literary niceties, and start from " some other point to make a bold attempt to determine " the respective ages of the several parts of the document; " when, for instance, they try to draw a hard and fast line " in the development of religious ideas, or to grapple with " the unproved assertion (e.g.) that the story of the flood " was first brought from Babel in the seventh century " B.C., they are putting to sea without rudder or compass, " and their craft is in danger of springing a leak."[80]

At the same time, it should not be forgotten that the positive view of Old Testament History is not yet shorn of all its difficulties. A later influence is not to be always (e.g. in Deuteronomy) point blank denied. There are some good Catholic commentators in France who consider the second part of Isaias more recent than the first, and relegate Daniel to the second century,[81] because, on this head, the Church has pronounced no decisions. On the whole, however, the history constructed on the Wellhausen hypothesis is far less satisfactory than that set forth in so natural a way by the sacred writers. There is no reason for assuming that the sojourn of the Jews in Egypt was owing rather to accident than to famine, as history can furnish parallel cases. The friendly attitude of Joseph best explains their sojourn in the land of Goshen. The exodus of the whole people, and the passage of the Red Sea, are only improbable when all miracles are rejected at the outset, and when the letter, as too often happens, is unduly strained; for the wording of the Old Testament,

80 Wellhausen, p. 50. Kayser, p. 13. Reuss, p. 22.71. Kuenen, *Hist. Krit. Einleitung in die Bücher des A.T.* 1. 1: *Die Entstehung des Hexateuch: Leipzig*, 1887, p. 111. Dillmann, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuter. und Iosua*, 2 Ed. Leipzig, 1886, p. 632.

81 *Controverse*, 1882, p. 598 seq. Compare Broglie, *Annales de Phil. chr.* 1887, 2. Haneberg, p. 190 seq.

as is well known, is generally exuberant. The same may be said of the 40 years' wandering in the wilderness. Miraculous food is repeatedly mentioned. But the herds of cattle are passed over in silence. During the thirty-eight years of peace, the tribes may have led a nomadic life. The apparently two-fold account of the Conquest in the book of Josue is quite intelligible, if we bear in mind that the first general assault could not be followed up and brought to a close except by a number of long-continued petty conflicts and conquests. The lands were not fully allotted to all the tribes till after a long period. The conquest was not effected in one war. In the time of the judges progress ebbed and flowed, the bond of union between the tribes slackened, and religious life was on the wane. Even the chosen people were men with human natures, subject to natural influences. But, to sum up our enquiry, it may be confidently affirmed that the history of Israel, apart from a divine revelation and a divine guidance, is utterly incomprehensible.

A direct solution of the problem can hardly be looked for in the New Testament. That it, however, indirectly recognizes the traditional history of the Old Testament is too clear to leave room for doubt. Christ and the Apostles set out from the Jewish Canon, and comprehend all Old Testament revelation in Moses and the prophets.[82] John says: "The Law was given by Moses."* By the Law he can only mean the Mosaic legislation, for the *modus loquendi* in this Gospel and in the New Testament warrants no other meaning. Some books of the Old Testament are mentioned by name or expressly quoted: the whole Pentateuch, Josue, II. Kings, III. Kings, Isaias, Jeremias, Daniel, Osee, Joel, Amos, Micheas, Habacuc, Aggæus, Zacharias, Malachias, Job, Psalms, and Proverbs. Reference is made to the following: Judges, I. Kings, IV. Kings, Esther, II. Paralipomenon, II. Machabees, Ezechiel, Jonas, Sophonias.

82 Matth. xxii. 9; Acts xviii. 24; II. Peter ii. 20; Rom. i. 2; II. Tim. iii. 15; M. v. 17; L. xvi. 29; xxiv. 27, 44; Acts xxviii., 23.

* John I., 17.

Ruth, Esdras, Nehemias, Abdias, Nahum, Ecclesiastes, Canticles. The Deuter-canonical books are not alluded to in the New Testament.[83]

We are, then, justified in taking our stand on the traditional Canon, with the Septuagint as the foundation. The more the critical school try to reduce the age of the Hebrew Canon, the less they are entitled to judge the deuteronomical and proto-canonical books by different standards. The connection of the Sapiential Books with Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Psalms, and indeed with Job, shows clearly that one and the same principle of development was at work in Palestine and Alexandria. In like manner the later historical books are connected with the books of Chronicles. One and the same spirit conducted the development of Judaism by different paths to one and the same end. The Christian Church preferred the Septuagint on linguistic grounds. It is the version mainly quoted by Evangelists and Apostles, although, as men of Palestine, they followed the Hebrew Canon.

In order to form a true estimate of the relations of Judaism to Christianity, the Messianic prophecies must be duly appreciated. The Old Testament gives us the history of divine revelation, which was a divine "pædagogia" preparing the chosen people for the Messianic kingdom. Belief in one God, in Jahve, is indissolubly linked with hope in a promised Redeemer. This hope is the point in which all revelation centres, from the Prot-evangelium in Paradise to John, the Precursor. A detailed explanation will be dealt with later on; here we only wish to emphatically insist that an unshaken hope in a future Messianic kingdom and, generally, the idea of a Messias in connection with the Theocracy, is the key-stone of the arch on which the whole history of Israel rests. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judas and David ever bore this idea in their breasts. Even in the hour of darkest tribulation, when hope in a glorious Messianic kingdom must have seemed to a dispassionate

83 Kaulen, l.c., p. 20. Cornely, *Introd. Special. in ll. V. T.*, Paris, 1887. II. 1–3 seq.

looker-on the flimsiest of chimeras, this flickering spark was acquiring a brighter glow. The prophets strove to deepen and to purify these hopes in a moral crucible. They stirred up the sense of sin, laid bare man's moral helplessness, and forcibly brought home to the people the need they had of a redeemer. They instilled into them the dispositions necessary for spiritual and moral renovation. They contrasted the law written on tables of stone with the law of the heart; they humbled the pride of princes, and bent the stiff necks of the people. All, in a word, who were unfaithful were rebuked. They proclaimed that legal ceremonies, and sacrifices, and external cleanliness, unless accompanied with a conversion of the heart to God, were insufficient. They did not, indeed, utter the name Messias, but they one and all held out the prospect of a Messianic age,—an age of peace and prosperity, and loyalty to Jahve. Some describe the form the new kingdom is to take, and are overjoyed, as in vision they see the people united, and keeping the covenant. Others fix their gaze on a person, a scion of the house of David, who is to set up a new empire. The warm colouring they imparted to the picture was borrowed from the splendour and magnificence of the kingdom of David and Solomon. But their eyes were turned to the future, and pierced the veil that enveloped the ideas of their contemporaries. Thus they dug deep foundations for unbounded confidence in God, encouraged the people in the hour of their deepest humiliation to hope for better things, spurred their drooping spirits to fresh moral efforts, and paved the way for universal monotheism and universal charity. Prophecy joins together things that are far and near; it represents as fulfilled what is being gradually accomplished. In this lies its significance for future ages and generations.

Long years rolled by before the teaching of the prophets bore fruit. Prophet succeeded prophet, threat followed on threat. But the people hearkened to the false flattering prophets who tickled their ears and their fancy, rather than to

the true prophets sent by Jahve in His vengeance. Not infrequently the prophets were persecuted and put to death. The more the people felt Jahve's chastening hand heavy upon them, the more they remembered their transgressions and the divine promises. With the Captivity all danger of apostasy had passed away. Thus revelation had in the main attained its purpose. Belief in the one true God, obedience to His law, and hope in the Messias were the very heart's blood of the people. God's law was their sanctification, and their comfort in trial. The prophecies were their sheet anchor. Whatever be said of their morality, it is futile to deny that in this respect they stood head and shoulders above their heathen neighbours. They feared God and worshipped Him with greater purity; they followed a higher moral code, and lived more chastely.

God, who in furthering His own divine plans knows how to bring good out of evil, turned the misfortunes of the chosen people to the profit of mankind. Israel was thereby purified and strengthened. But more than this, being dispersed among heathen peoples they helped to make the true knowledge of God and hope in a Messias more widely known. Alexander the Great, by conquering the Medes and Babylonians, and penetrating as far as Egypt, assisted in blending Jewish and Greek civilization. From Alexandria revealed truth travelled to the Greek and Roman empires. Jews settled at every grand emporium. They built synagogues, and began to make proselytes. Many heathens, earnestly longing for truth and redemption, frequented the synagogues, and there learnt God's love and Jahve's promises. The one word "Redemption' was enough to draw men open to conversion. Thus Israel, while unfurling the banner of revolt against the Messias,* was an instrument in God's hands for bringing the heathen to Christ.

The sacrifices offered at Jerusalem had a large share in keeping alive the consciousness of sin. At this period, at all events,

* Romans, ix.-xi.

sacrifice was a function with a religious aspect; otherwise it is unintelligible. During the Captivity circumcision and the Sabbath were the shibboleth. After the Captivity, when the Temple was rebuilt, sacrifices were again offered. On the three chief feasts the men of Israel made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and all the people sacrificed to the Lord. Israel was so saturated with the idea that they were God's people, and that Jerusalem was the centre whence salvation was to go forth to the whole world, that the yoke of the Lord appeared to them sweet, and its burden light. No people ever had their God so near to them as Israel. Their feasts and sacrifices had a typical as well as an historical significance. Of the former we shall speak later. The Jews were too firmly persuaded that the law was to last for ever to see this typical significance. Of the fulfilment of the law, they were conscious only in part, and that on the outward rim. In many points the natural observance of the law had become impossible. When Solomon's temple was destroyed, the divine Schechina, the sacred fire, the ark of the covenant, and the Urim-Thummim of the high priest disappeared. The prescriptions relative thereto had also become absolete. During the Captivity prayer had been substituted for sacrifice, and this usage was afterwards transferred to Palestine. The building of synagogues indicates a change in the law, while the creation of doctors of the law and the rise of sects and parties constitute a new departure in religious life. The letter was saved, but the spirit was killed. The superiority of the chosen people degenerated into national vanity, and was dwarfed to an illusion. And yet this self-righteousness could hardly satisfy earnest souls, who could not but feel how their outward behaviour gave the lie to their professions. Accursed was he who did not keep the whole law! Who would attempt it! All things, both in politics and social life, combined to intensify the yearning for a Messias and king, who should deliver men from sin and evil, and rescue them from bondage and misery. The Jewish Apocalypses before

Christ (Henoch, IV. Esdras), and in particular the Jewish Targums (Jonathan) of the 1st century, boldly declare that a change must come. They say that the Messias will both chasten and forgive sin, and bestow justification and peace. Jonathan points out that the Messias will exercise a triple office,—prophet, priest, and king.[84]

84 Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palestina, zur Zeit Christi.* Freiburg, 1886, p. 423 seq.

CHAPTER VI.

NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS.

As an appendix to the history of the Jewish and Semitic religions, we will now deal with two phenomena in religious history, which have endured to our own day: Talmudistic Judaism and Islam.

1. Talmudistic Judaism.

The work of Judaism did not finish with its preparation for the Messias. The Jews believe that the Messias is still to come. They beguiled themselves with false and worldly hopes in the Messias, which grew in strength and rose in height, as the Jewish state was hastening to its fall. The more they were down-trodden and crushed beneath the foreigner's galling yoke, the more their thoughts took wing to the bright and glorious future, which they believed to be in store for them. It was these false, worldly hopes that caused them to forfeit the Messianic salvation. Nevertheless, those revealed truths, whose foundations lay in the Old Testament, were not to be wholly without effect on the blinded people of Israel. Though sorely afflicted and almost annihilated, once under Titus (70 A.D.) and again under Hadrian (136 A.D. or 130 ?), this determined race were still possessed of enough sinewy vigour to inaugurate

a religious reformation. Though driven from Palestine, and scattered over the broad world, they still looked upon the Old Testament, the tradition of the Synagogue, and hope in the Messias as their joint inheritance. These were the beacon-lights that guided them amid the rocks and shoals; the hope that buoyed them up in a stormy sea; the magnet that held them together in unity of faith and morals; the elixir that fostered in them a spirit of exclusiveness towards heathens and Christians.

Talmudistic Judaism came into being in Christian times. It dates from the destruction of the Temple,—the central sanctuary of the national worship. Hence it is peculiar in having neither priesthood nor sacrifice. All these necessarily fall or stand together. For centralization would brook no sacrifice or priesthood outside the holy city, Jerusalem. The scribes who, in the last centuries before Christ, had overspread the law with a network of human ordinances, became heirs by default of the priesthood. Prayer-meetings and preachments in the synagogues were the sole remaining shred of the ancient glory of the temple. Tradition had been broken in bits by direful calamities; but the scribes gathered the fragments, lest they should perish, and welded them together in writing. And while the paraphrasts (Onkelos, Jonathan) and Alexandrine philosophers were diluting Jewish belief with rationalism, and seeking to sauce it according to the palate of the age, the scribes were codifying existing traditions. Thus they fondly hoped to erect a breakwater powerful enough to stem the flood of rationalism and unbelief, and to arrest the current of foreign ideas. After the destruction of Jerusalem they founded a school of scribes at Jamnia (Jabne). Similar schools were subsequently opened at Tiberias and Babylon. Towards the close of the second century the collection of the legal portion (*Halacha*) was complete. To this collection the name Mischna (δευτέρωσις, second legislation) was given. In Palestine the Mischna was explained and supplemented by the Gemara (completion). The two go to make up the Jerusalem Talmud.

The Babylonian scribes also drew up a Gemara, suited to their particular circumstances. This, combined with the Mischna, forms the Babylonian Talmud. The work was not finished till about the year 500 A.D., or thereabouts. From first to last the Talmud contains nought but human ordinances, generally in the form of anecdotes told by famous Rabbis. Imbedded in heaps of dross are a few grains of gold. Let him find them who can. Christian reminiscences are spiced with a bitter hatred of unbelievers—i.e., Christians. The Midraschim (commentaries, explanations) are a string of pithy interpretations, of special texts,—being either exquisitely subtle reasonings or a mere play upon words, suggested by accidental resemblances between words in different places. Whole pages are a chain of puzzles which none but the initiated can solve. A translation without the key of historical and objective explanations, is useless.

Still more mysterious is the *Kabbala* (*acceptio*) or secret tradition of the Jews, which was afterwards utilized for extracting a hidden meaning from Holy Scripture. While many Jews during the Middle Ages were held captive by a kind of mysticism in regard to numbers, due, probably, to the influence of Neo-Platonism, a rationalistic school was growing up at Cordova. The origin of the Kabbala may be traced to pre-Christian times. As a commentary, it is most artificial. Besides pretending to discern divine secrets in every letter of the law, and appealing to a tradition that is said to stretch back to Abraham and Adam, it propounds a system of emanation which, though of Eastern origin, has a strong family likeness with Valentinianism.[1]

The Jews, on their side, maintain that Talmudistic Theology has spread civilization and opened out rich ores in the Old Testament. As, indeed, Jewish learning stood Origen and

1 Denzinger, *Vier Bücher von der religiösen Erkenntniss*. Würzburg, 1856, I, p. 308. See also the articles in the *Kirchenlexicon*; also Schürer, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1874. 2nd Ed. 1886. Haneberg, *Geschichte der Offenbarung*. 4th Ed. 1876. Krüger, *Arten Schlechter Frömmigkeit im Talmud*. *Theolog. Quart*. 1887, Nos. 3 4.

Jerome in good stead, so many converted Jews in the Middle Ages employed their Hebrew and Talmudistic lore to defend Christian truth. Other scholars, Nicholas de Lyra for instance, enriched their commentaries with the learning they had acquired when sitting at the feet of Jewish Rabbis. And yet the gain was formal rather than material. Christian theologians in the West had long been independently engaged in studying the Old Testament, although, as is easily understood, they took less account of the original text. Mayhap, R. Gerschom (b. 960) gave some impetus to Jewish studies, but Venerable Bede, Rabanus Maurus, Walafried Strabo, Paschasius Radbertus, and others had written commentaries on the Old Testament, long before any independent Jewish exegesis existed in the West.[2] During the Middle Ages Judaism, in a narrow spirit of exclusiveness, held aloof from Christian surroundings, but, later on, especially when quickened by the spirit of reform, it allowed Christian influence wider scope. This, however, was a concession rather to rational philosophy than to positive Christianity. The more educated Christians belie the Christian spirit, the more easily the Semitic spirit gains the ascendent in the spiritual as as well as in the material sphere. It is far more to the purpose to quicken the Christian spirit than to foster Anti-Semitism. The Jews have plainly once more secularized their Messianic hopes; but the secular colouring is not of the same tint now as it was in the days of Christ. Humanly speaking, the day on which Romans XI. 25 is to be fulfilled is still dim in the distance.

---

2. ISLAM.

A religion, far transcending in importance this tattered remnant of the religion of a people at once chosen and rejected, is Islam (perfect resignation to God's will).[3] Originally it

2 *Revue de l'hist. des rel.* 1880. II. p. 222. Compare also Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testamentes in der christlichen Kirche*, Jena, 1869.

3 Compare Surah, III. v. 5., in Ullmann's edit. p. 36, A. I. 77.

branched off from Judaism. It numbers many devotees, and has for centuries wielded a fascinating power over millions of men. Even in our own day, when its foundations are tottering, it is displaying a great power of expansion in Africa, Southern Asia, and the South Sea Islands. Judged by the number of its adherents, and the area over which it is spread, it might be classed as a world-wide religion. Islam now embraces within its folds 175,000,000 men.

Islam had for its founder Mohammed (the praiseworthy),[4] who was born at Mecca in 570 (571) A.D. Having lost his father before he was born, he was brought up with his four uncles as the foster-son of his grandfather Abdulmotaleb, who was the representative of the Haschem line of the tribe of Koreish. As such, it was at once his privelege and his duty to entertain all who made a pilgrimage to the Kaaba, or temple which Abraham and Ishmael, according to tradition, built at Mecca. It was in the days of Abraham that the black stone, now so greatly prized and venerated, fell from heaven, and lodged in the temple. In this way, and also by accompanying the family merchants in their expeditions to the northern confines of Arabia, the religiously-minded Mohammed became deeply versed in Arabian traditions, and in Jewish and Christian doctrines. At that time there were in Arabia Jews, Christians and Ishmaelites, who, in defiance of the dominant polytheism and superstition, paid homage to Abraham (Ibrahim) the monotheist. The chequered struggles, carried on with alternating fortune between Jews and Christians, had filled the country with Abyssinian and Persian mercenaries. So Mohammed had exceptional opportunities for studying these religions. Nor had the ill-feeling existing between the several factions escaped his

4 For the more ancient literature see *Kirchenlexicon* VII. 188; V. 845 seq. For the more recent, A. Müller, *Der Islam im Morgen und Abendland*, Berlin, 1885. Krehl *Das Leben des Mohammed*, Leipzig, 1885. Hirschfeld, *Beiträge zur Erklärung de. Koran*, Leipzig, 1886. Goldziher, *Le culte des Saints chez les Musulmans Revue de l'hist.* 1880, p. 257. Himpel in *Quartalschrift*, 1882, p. 86, 206. Möhler, *Ueber das Verhältniss des Islams zum Evangelium. Gesamm. Schriften*, 1839, I, 348, seq.

notice. He was familiar with the Old Testament, the Gospels, and Jewish tradititions. In the Koran he appeals to the Scriptures. All his knowledge he put out at interest from the very first. He set out in bold relief the contradictory constructions put upon various passages of Scipture, especially all having reference to the Messias. And he was not slow to make capital out of the differences.

In his twenty-fifth year he took to wife Chadidscha. A relative of his wife, Waraka by name, is said to be largely responsible for the religious training of Mohammed's mind. He is said to have been not only a Christian, but a priest (perhaps in the sense of the Nazarenes.) But the Scriptures and the personages just named were not the sole factors in Mohammed's religious development. The chief factor, no doubt, was his subjective disposition of soul. His nature was cast in a musing meditative mould. His force of inward concentration soon burst into flame and exploded in ecstacies and angelic visions. And he saw in vision Gabriel,—the angel whom the Koran identifies with the spirit of God. At first his mind was troubled, like a fountain stirred, and he himself saw not the bottom of it. Chadidscha strove hard to pacify him. But she found it a heavy task. Even she feared that it might be a delusion conjured up by evil spirits. At length, when Mohammed was forty years old, the angel beckoned him to Mount Hora, placed a scroll in his hands, and bade him read. And thus spake the vision: "O Mohammed, thou art the ambassador of God. I am Gabriel." This incident is recorded in the 96th surah or chapter of the Koran. Hence interpreters set this down as the oldest portion of the Koran,[5] and regard this revelation as the first revelation. The vision was followed by feverish convulsions and nervous paroxysms of such violence, that his enemies, with some show of plausibility, taunted him with being possessed. Mohammed now assumed the prophet's mantle. But few believed in him,

5 As to the further development compare Surah 74, 1-7; 51, 50; 26, 192-195.

and he made only slight headway. When he was fifty years old, death snatched from him the faithful Chadidscha and his uncle Abu Tab, who had been his mainstay and arm of defence. Disappointments rained upon him thick and fast, and his nostrils were stretched with struggling against misfortune.

The so-called journey to heaven wrought a complete change in him.[6] That it was a reality and no dream, he was firmly convinced. Fear and vacillation gave way to a determination more stubborn-hard than hammered iron. The ecstatic visionary, and nervous enthusiast vanished in the sunbeams, and there remained only the cool, shrewd and calculating founder of a religion. But the hostility of his foes at Mecca was so unrelenting, and their hatred so bitter, that he was driven to take up his abode in Medina, where he had a large following. This took place in the year 622 A.D. Hence this year, with which the Mohammedan era begins, is known as the year of the Hejra or Flight. At Medina Mohammed began to legislate. He prescribed a liturgy. He ordered mosques to be built, on which all others should be modelled. About this time he organized filibustering expeditions, known as the sacred wars, for despoiling his enemies, the Jew and the Christian. All who kill a foe or lay down their lives in the holy wars are accounted in the Koran as worthy of all honour, and as the heirs of great promises. But the armed pilgrimage in the eighth year of the Hejra invested these raids in the eyes of the Arabs with a sacred character. For he then gained possession of the central sanctuary of Arabia. Violent measures now became the ordinary means of propagating his teaching. The Greek emperor was specially marked out for vengeance, because, the year before, he, like other princes, had ungraciously received the ambassadors Mohammed had sent to plead for recognition. His mighty projects, however, were nipped in the bud. For sickness attacked him, and he died at Medina on June the 8th, 632 A.D.

6 Surah, 53, 1 seq.

The judgments passed on Mohammed vary with the temperament of historians. On the whole, however, they incline to acquit him of the charge of wilful imposture, and credit him with good faith. His intercourse with women excepted, it is argued, Mohammed lived plainly and frugally, and died poor,—facts utterly unintelligible, had ambition been his only guiding star. Such is the argument on which the biographers lay most stress. The suggestion that Mohammed was a conscious impostor, who degraded religion to an instrument for self-seeking, is, in Mohler's eyes,[7] wholly without historical foundation, and fit as mental food, only for such as accept Voltaire's poems and Goethe's plagiarisms as history. Mohammed's relations with the monk Bahira (though somewhat mythical), his passionate love of solitude, his age when he assumed the *rôle* of prophet, the critical attitude of the intelligent Chadidscha, the loyalty of his uncle and nearest relatives, unshaken amid the most trying circumstances,—all this reveals the common impostor as little as the fact that a few mules and camels, an hundred sheep and a domestic cock, constituted the entire personal effects of the conqueror of Arabia. Furthermore, Mohammed's biographers tell us that he sat on the ground, milked his goats, mended his clothes and shoes, passed a whole month without a fire in his house, and that, when he was dying, he had not a bit of barley bread to allay the pinching pangs of hunger. Dates and water were the only food of which he and his wife and children partook.

Nevertheless Möhler, like Mohammed's latest biographers, though for other reasons, seems to me to judge both Mohammed and the Koran too leniently. In the beginning Mohammed was undoubtedly convinced that he had been constituted a prophet. And seeing, in sorrow, the crude superstition to which his kinsfolk were enslaved, he deemed it his duty to restore faith in the one God of Abraham. Still it is equally clear that he subsequently played the false prophet. Möhler himself

7 L. c., p. 367.

directs attention to certain appeals he made to revelations on purpose to soften the jealousies of the harem, and to banish strife from the household. *Bona fides* is put out of court by surahs 36 and 66. The glorification of such ugly episodes as these, which are in themselves a stain on Mohammed's character, may palliate their heinousness, but cannot establish *bona fides*. They are by no means isolated instances. The Koran's monstrous connivance at sensuality, and the alluring prospect of "untouched women" in Paradise (held out as a special inducement to join the crusade against unbelievers) are such astounding excrescences in the history of religion that they cannot have been grafted on good faith.

Besides, such a conclusion, even speculatively considered, is unwarranted. In order to prove his prophetical character and to establish an analogy with Jewish history, Mohammed asserted *usque ad nauseam* that Jews and Christians had falsified the Scriptures, by expunging all the passages that pointed to himself as the long-promised prophet. In proof he was surely bound to produce a genuine and unfalsified copy of the Scriptures. Unless a genuine Scripture were in existenee, Mohammed's charge is both unproven and unproveable. But Mohammed never tried to prove it to the hilt by producing the copy. The complaint, made in olden times by Jews and Christians, that the Scriptures had been falsified, had at least some outward semblance of truth, because two versions were at hand. But Mohammed could never advance the same plea, and his charge is demonstrably unjustified. Whatever may have been his dispositions at the outset, it is certain that, as time went on, his prophetic conscience melted into thin air. The Koran, in great part, can be ascribed to none but a false prophet. Of course, Islam's widespread dominion is not the outcome of religious imposture; but the man, who was at first the dupe of ecstasies and visions, gradually became *nolens vlenso* a more or less conscious impostor. His own avowedly sensual nature contrived to allow a wide berth to sensuality,

and made it spread like wildfire among sensual tribes with flickering morals. The violence that characterized Mohammed's later life, his hatred of his enemies (of which we catch a glimpse in the Koran), his war of extermination, may explain the swift propagation of Islam, but they hardly enhance the prophetic dignity. His appeal to the sensual worship of the ancient Semites is an extenuating circumstance only in so far as it shows that he knew how to mould the dispositions of his people to the best advantage. But as Judaism and Christianity were known to him, those poor idolaters were entitled to a nobler religious ideal at his hands. But he inaugurated a retrogade movement. "He destroyed all the barriers that "Arabian manners and customs had carefully erected against "what even his kinsfolk called licentiousness, transgression, "and crime."[8] An unselfishness, dictated by circumstances of prudence, cannot outweigh these considerations. How well Mohammed knew to combine ambition with unselfishness!

Mohammed's teaching is set forth in the canonical book of the Moslems,—the Koran (the Reading). Unlike the sacred books of Jews and Christians, the Koran repeatedly sings its own praises. It consists of 114 surahs or chapters. Mohammed, even if he did not encourage the compilation of the whole work, certainly ordered all the revelations vouchsafed to him after his fortieth year to be noted down. In the "book that came down from heaven" he saw the best proof of his mission. Abubekr, the first Kalif, bound together the stray leaves and notes, without attempting to arrange them chronologically. The several copies began to show such considerable discrepancies, that Osman, the third Kalif, ordered a recension to be made. Copies of this were scattered broadcast, and it still remains the official text. Maybe the original abounds in pretty poetry; maybe, also, as connoisseurs maintain, it is religion-inspiring. Perhaps, too, its contents, which sound strange to Western ears, improve on acquaintance when viewed from an Eastern stand-

8 L.c. p. 378. Compare Surah, 33. Kuenen, *Volksreligion* p. 32.

point, and in connection with the body of Islam tradition. Be this as it may, I must own that these bright sides almost wholly escaped my observation amid the tedious and prolix repetition of trivial ordinances, and irrelevant details. The deep religious foundation is buried under an avalanche of wars and domestic broils. The ever-glowing fire of religious fanaticism casts a lurid light on the passages, with a true Christian colouring, that preach patience and benevolence. However, lest I should seem biassed, I append the verdict of Derenbourg, an eminent Koran scholar; "At least two-thirds of the Koran," he says, "are taken up with silly apostrophes, attacks on other religions, "incitements to anger, impatient murmurings over one's lot, "war-bulletins, written in a careless style at a time when the prophet so lost heart in his trials and struggles that he hardly believed in his own divine mission."[9]

To gain a clear idea of the doctrinal and moral teaching of the Koran, we must start from the first principle of Islam, i.e., from absolute, abstract, exclusive monotheism, which represents the divine being as independent and helpless, and the creature of fate. This is the "central idea of Judaism transferred to Arabian soil." God's omnipotence is caprice; man's power consists in being a blind tool of the Almighty; thus he is to attain with certainty the goal marked out for him for all eternity. Angels, indeed, are recognized as intermediaries, but they figure like menials at the court of an Oriental despot, falling down on bended knee before the newly created Adam.[10] Mohammed learnt the Trinity from the New Testament; but he conceives it as Father, Son, and Mary.[11] He impugns it rightly in this form, but wrongly in its correct form. Like wary Orientals, he starts with a materialistic idea of Father and Son, and tries to explain the universe purely and simply by the power of the one lord. For the rest Christ is a prophet and

9 *Revue de l'hist.* 1886. XIII. p. 294.

10 *Theol, Quartalschr.* 1882, p. 91. Kuenen, *Volksreligion*, p. 27.

11 Compare the Egyptian Trinity in chapter III.

the son of Mary; he dwells on high, but has no claim to divine honours. Christ is to Mohammed what Moses is to Christ, that is he predicted the coming of Allah's prophet, "the seal of the prophets." Then by degrees Mohammed ousted Christ, and thrust himself into the office held by Christ, that is as mediator between Allah and the faithful. Allah is great and Mohammed is his prophet. God and the forgiveness of sins are obtainable only through the prophet. No one who believes in him can be lost for ever.[12] But Mohammed was sent to all men, and not merely to the Arabians, and therefore special envoys were sent to all princes to obtain his recognition. Thus Mohammed set himself above Christ, and exalted the intrinsic value of his message above the gospel. The prayer for protection and intercession now addressed to the prophet contradicts the essential principles of sound theology.

Mohammed was powerless to produce any proof in support of his claim. It was not simply modesty that caused him to dispense with working miracles. In his life time the absence of divine credentials was keenly felt. It is related in the Koran that the Arabs wished to see a miracle wrought by him. The believers said, we are told:[13] The Koran is a sheer lie, in the fabrication of which others (Jews) had a hand. * * * They say also, it contains nothing but fables about the men of old, which Mohammed ordered to be written down, and read out every evening and morning. * * * They say: what an envoy is this! He eats food and walks in the streets as we ourselves. Unless an angel comes down to him and accompanies him to preach; or unless a treasure is thrown down to him, or he receives a garden from which to draw nourishment, we will not believe. To this Mohammed puts in Allah's mouth the words:[14] "Nothing prevents us from sending thee with miracles but "the fact that nations that have gone before charged even

12 Surah xxi., 7; xxi., 14; xxii. 14; and *Theol. Quart.* l.c.
13 Surah xxv. 1 seq.
14 Surah xxvii., 92–96. Comp. Ullman, p. 2333.

"them with deceit. * * * We send no more envoys, with "miracles, except to strike terror." Besides being evasive this answer shows how little *bona fides* remained at last. No! Mohammed stands out in his true colours as the crafty founder of a religion, with his aims clearly in view. From the first it was a fixed idea in his head to unite the religious and political power, and to make physical force his chief weapon. This reply is in nowise analogous to that given by Jesus [15] to the taunts of the Jews, concerning Him and John; for, Jesus could truly point to the fact that wisdom was justified in her works.

As Mohammed aimed at being a perfect man, [16] and nothing more than a man, he laid no claim to special mysteries. He is but a "follower of Islam," a "good example to all who place their trust in God." He possesses none of Allah's treasures. Of things that are hidden he knows neither more nor less than other men. He makes "no pretension to being an angel." He claims to be not the "father of the faithful," but only the ambassador of God, a prophet, and the last of the prophets, who stands in closer union with God than the prophets and legislators of other religions. In this lies his greatness. "Islam's tremendous and overpowering idea of the greatness of God has been the only obstacle to Mohammed's being raised above humanity—to a share in the Godhead; for this would be "an encroachment on God's absolutely inaccessible domain.[17] Not the littleness of the prophet but the infinite greatness of Allah compels Islam to make its prophet a mere man. For the rest the faults of his race were so fully revealed in his person that he could with perfect justice lay claim to all that is human. We will not discuss the alleged assassinations, but his conduct to his wives and female slaves, his boast about his generative powers, his theoretical and practical teaching of blood revenge, his fanatical bloodthirsty wars, and much more beside are facts

15 Math. xi., 16-19. See Luke xvi., 29.
16 Surah vi.
17 *Revue*, p. 260.

which show that he was guided by right reason when he renounced all claim to divinity. No prophet in the Old Testament, or saint in the New, has so many dark spots on his character. When Mohammed appeals to God's revelations to beat down all opposition, it is not the abstract notion of monotheistic unity that forced him into this position. The stress thus laid on God's power and man's helplessness, on the incomprehensibility of God's counsels and the capricious fate overhanging man could not possibly, as it seems to me, have proceeded from an unconscious ecstatic tendency. The character of the founder should be put in the witness box. Without the person of Mohammed, Islam is utterly incomprehensible. The despotic monotheism of its faith can only be understood after other causes have frozen the heart against the gospel. Of revelation or inspiration from above there is not a trace. To this fact the human soul cannot close its eyes for long.

Despite all efforts to the contrary, the dogmatic teaching of Islam has held fast to the truth that Mohammed's call was not due to his perfections. His vocation was purely an act of God's will. Tradition, however, has thought otherwise. Later writers have keenly felt the necessity of exalting him above ordinary mortals into a supernatural sphere, of ascribing to him a higher knowledge, and of investing him with the power of working miracles. In their eyes he is the prophet who repudiated higher powers and superhuman knowledge; he is a Thaumaturgus, and a divine being. They were keenly alive to the necessity of putting him on an equal footing with other prophets. While Mohammed had charged Jews and Christians with falsifying the Scriptures, later writers strove to show that Scripture, even in its present form, pointed him out as the Paraclete.[18] A full-fledged prophet was soon ready to hand. The multitude wanted not only a God, but something wonderful and supernatural besides. At first they did not believe in

18 Deuteron. p. xxxiii. See Moehler, p. 354.

Mohammed's death, and dogmatic teaching went in search of speculative proof for it. But "in this case, as in many "others, it has distorted the simplicity and grandeur of "the original Islam idea, and stuffed a Mohammedan re-"ligious philosopher with Mussulman notions."[19] Beginning and progress may be more closely distinguished in Islam than in any other religion. By contrasting the lowly beginning of a parvenu with his subsequent haughty ascendency, the religious historian will find the clue to a clear historical appreciation of a great religious movement. Judaism and Christianity, on the other hand, betray no desire to hide their true origin, but appear from the first, stamped with a supernatural seal.

Veneration of saints is another means of filling in the gap between heaven and earth, between God and man, and of satisfying the natural yearning of the heart for a mediator, and union with God. Of such the Koran knows nothing, for it directly contradicts the idea of the one unapproachable God. Man may worship and invoke none other but the one God. The Koran allows no other being to be worshipped. The martyrs and the just, though happy in Paradise, have no concern with the living, and are not entitled to veneration.[20] And yet, how quickly the worship of saints gained a footing in Islam,—a worship not only of dead but also of living saints! A true worship of man! Images, indeed, Islam forbids; but even here it contradicts itself by accepting the Kaaba. The chapels erected over the graves of men who, though not canonized, are saints in popular estimation, were visited in pilgrimage. In like manner, relics were also venerated. Saints were invoked as most efficacious guardians of the faithful. Legends, too, have played a conspicuous part in Islam. True to their Oriental origin, they abound in exaggerations and improbabilities, and swarm with monsters and giants. Thus by heaping miracles on miracles, a grotesque Hagiology of

19 *Revue*, p. 264.
20 Surah xi. 13.

Mussulman adventurers was formed. The saints are chiefly taken from among men; still not a few women are also venerated. To this day saints, *Weslis*, occupy a very prominent place in the worship of Islam.

The Mussulman enjoys this life, but his future and fatalistic hopes are turned to the next life, to Paradise, which all true believers are sure to enter. Promises of reward in the next life are as numerous in the Koran, as threats of everlasting fire in hell; but these latter are mostly reserved for unbelievers. The joys of Paradise are of a sensual kind, and conjure up reminiscences of the harem. Mohammed also taught that Christ will come again.

This sufficiently indicates the drift of Islam morality. It takes its stand more on the Old Testament than on the New, though the Koran has many fine passages on this head. The good works enjoined in the Old Testament, especially the protection of widows and orphans, are recommended as occasion offers. This is the standard according to which rewards and punishments are measured. Here the righteous Moslem and the Jew meet on equal terms. External works are to the front; but humility, repentance for sin, and the nobler feelings of the heart are violently and mercilessly suppressed. Selfish enjoyment of possessions is the sole motive, and sensuality the centre of the moral life. This finds its chief expression in polygamy which, significantly enough, regulates the number of a Moslem's wives in proportion to his fortune, just as he may keep a greater or less number of camels according to his means. The Koran, indeed, though sanctioning only four wives, allows an unlimited number of female slaves. On this point Mohammed cannot be exculpated on the plea of ignorance. For the directions, repeated over and over again, are most detailed. Such minuteness shows how well he foresaw the consequences of this institution, and how shrewdly he had calculated its advantages to his policy. But still it may be urged that the precepts of the Koran must not be confounded

with the detestable abuses perpetrated by certain Mussulman tribes. The Koran not only recommends that women be well treated, but it puts them almost on an equal footing with men. "For Moslem men and women, for believing men and women, "for true, patient men and women, for those who give alms and "fast, for chaste men and women who often think of God, God "has prepared reconciliation and a great reward."[31] True, but is not the law honoured more in the breach than in the observance? Are not the numerous abuses rooted in the institution? What redress has a woman even among the "civilized" Turks, against the whims and caprices of the man? The miseries of family life and Islam's hostility to civilization, are part and parcel of this institution. The Japanese are not far wrong in regarding all attempts at civilization fruitless, so long as the status and education of women are unchanged. All this in addition to a demoralising slavery which Islam admits in principle, and extensively puts in practice, conjures up a heart-rending picture of the frightful errors to which a great mass of human beings are a prey. Revenge for bloodshed has been already mentioned.

On other "moral" questions little need be said. Circumcision, though not explicitly prescribed in the Koran, has the force of law. Out of compliment to the Jews pork was forbidden, and, in the seventh year of the Hejra, Mohammed extended the prohibition to wine.

Prayer is ordered five times a day. At first Mohammed ordered the face to be turned during prayer towards Jerusalem; then worshippers were bidden to look towards Mecca (to the Kibla); but facing in other directions was also quite allowable. Fasting was prescribed chiefly during the month of Ramadan; but the spirit that should accompany fasting was not a necessary adjunct. Hence, as has been remarked, even on fasting-days everything was allowed at night. Contrast with this St. Paul's delicate and dignified treatment of such subjects.* Sacrifice

Surah, xxiii. Ullman, p. 269.
Cor., vii.

and priesthood have no place in their worship, which never alludes to sin or remorse of conscience; a pure heart and a moral sense are its object and aim. Everything is made to turn on the will of a despotic, capricious, and absolute God. No other religion has created such insurmountable barriers between the infinite God, and weak, finite man. The dervishes, with their senseless dances, lend enchantment to the view, but cannot bridge over the distance. The five "pillars" of religion are ablutions, prayer, fasting, pilgrimage (to Mecca) and almsgiving.[22] "The pivots on which Islam turns are "rewards and punishments, sensible pleasure and pain, power "and dominion, fear and hope."

In his dealings with Christianity Mohammed was not consistent. In many places the Koran enjoins peace and forbearance towards Christians. The envenomed hostility which ordered Christians to be exterminated was of later growth, and has no precedent in the Koran. Mohammed declares that the theory which teaches that only one religion can be true, is a gigantic error. The diversity of religions, he says, is founded on the nature of God, and only in the next life will it appear which has truth on its side. It behoves all—Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans—to live according to the word that God has made known to them, and to be prepared to render an account on the day of the inexorable judgment.[23] But there are other passages in the Koran not less numerous, which speak in an opposite sense. There is a formal command to outlaw Christianity, and to destroy it root and branch.[24] Whence comes this contradiction? In matters of casuistry, Mussulman doctors tell us, the majority carries the day. But this answer will not remove the contradiction. Perhaps the difference of time will. What then about the difference of time? This is not easily decided, as internal grounds are our only guide as to the consecutiveness of the surah. Next it should be explained

22 Surah ii. 180. *Kirchenlexicon*, v. 845. Teichmüller, p. 269.
23 Surah v. 21, 56; iv 105 Moehler, p 360 seq
24 Surah ix

why Mohammed changed his mind. Möhler argues very plausibly that this was brought about when the religion, which was originally national, became universal, and the national monarchy was converted into an universal monarchy. From belief in one God he argued to an universal religion; the union of religion and politics, of Church and state, egged him on to an universal monarchy. In this as in other matters we feel bound to demur to this lenient judgment. In our opinion other considerations were not wanting. Jews and Christians were too numerous in Arabia to be proscribed at once. But with success his pretensions, his intolerance, and his lust of dominion grew apace. And, as history is witness, Christianity has had no more formidable foe than Islam. Mohammed's toleration was born of political sagacity rather than of virtue for religion. It extended only so far as circumstances required and after all it was a very low degree of toleration, as Christians were everywhere without rights and power, and were liable to be violently persecuted.

Here we have a clue to the progress made by Islam, which still continues to spread in Africa, Thibet, China, Turkestan, and the Oceanic Islands.[25] Its dogmatic basis is so broad, that room can be found for every pet view and crotchet. Only three fixed dogmas are of faith: The unity of Allah, the prophetical character of Mohammed, Allah's ambassador, and the resurrection on the day of judgment. The moral ordinances are in part so natural, in part so human, that almost everything is allowed. Sensuality and happiness, both in this life and the next, joined with a fatalistic trust in Allah, have raised Oriental fanaticism to fever heat, and given it a prodigious power of physical development which sweeps down all impediments in its path. At first, none but a few young relatives of Mohammed had a spark of enthusiasm. But when enticing earthly promises were sounded in every key, and a fine prospect of plunder and enjoyment was opened out, enthusiasm abounded. In the

25 Saussaye. p 186, 205

doctrine of fatalism princes find a ready-made excuse for their faults, and a prop of despotism; to subjects it serves as a cloak for passions, and encourages them to spend merrily a life over which they have no control.[36] Then, again, the circumstances of the time were favourable to Islam. Oriental Christians were halting between the traditional sensual religion and the ethical requirements of Christianity. Driven hither and thither, uncertain whether to take refuge in a human Christ or in the etherial Christ of the Docetist, weakened by the interminable disputes between Arians, Gnostics and Catholics, they were shaken in faith, and split up into hostile parties and factions. Such a Babel of discord would have given Mohammed the impression that Christianity was divided into sects, none of which professed Christianity in its original form. The Greek empire was in a rapid decline, and was compelled to defend itself against its aggressive foes in the East. Hence Islam, with a most varied assortment of weapons, among which force was not the least, had not a formidable task to make itself master of the East. The Christian historian is forced to lament and weep over the devastation of flourishing Christian provinces in Asia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and North Africa; but Möhler thinks, not without reason, that these peoples were as yet hardly ripe for Christianity. The disputes between Gnostics and Montanists, between Arians, Nestorians and Monophysites are a proof that the spirit of Christianity had not taken deep root. If this was the case in the towns, what must have been the case in the country? The epistles of the writer of the Apocalypse give some idea of the state of Asia Minor.

In the course of its history Islam also conquered many heathen tribes which, in great part, were in a lower scale of civilization, and were still less ripe for Christianity. Whether the tribes of Central Asia are to be so classed is doubtful, for there is much to be said for the view that they once stood higher; and this is absolutely true of Africa and the South Sea

36 *Reuss*, p. 324. Kuenen, p. 37.

Islands. Islam is certainly an improvement on horrible superstition, combined with human sacrifices and cannibalism. In a certain sense Islam stands higher than Judaism. It recognises the Gospel, names Christ with great reverence, and even honours Mary as the Mother of Jesus. Moreover, it is also more successful in its missionary efforts than the Jews, who gain no proselytes. Its universality is other than that of the Jews (although not the spiritual and moral universality of Christianity). It is an universality of the imagination rather than of the mind.

Its present attitude, we regret to say, is not, as sanguine minds would hope, that of preparation for Christianity. On the contrary, the nations addicted to Islam are, as a rule, lost to Christian Missions. These poor savages, indeed, now worship one true God. This may be progress, but much still remains to be done. Polygamy not only flourishes, but is even sanctioned. The reins of despotism are being tightened rather than slackened in the family and in the state. Thus the gate is spread wide for the passions. The fanaticism with which Islam inspires all its followers, makes the future fraught with anxiety. Maybe Islam's blind fanaticism will lose its fury, when its political connection with the Sultan shall have been wrecked; but so far the hope is slight. It is a question of force.

One thing, however, may even now be safely affirmed. Were it not for an indwelling divine power in the Church, she would never have been able to withstand the powerful assaults of unbridled sensuality and brute force. If, in the teeth of such weapons, she has overcome Islam as she formerly overcame the Roman Empire, if she has saved civilization and morality from being trampled on by barbarians (and in the present stationary condition of Islam, the enemy of progress), then the Church is certainly a work of God. "Instead of saying: If Mohammed "has succeeded, Christ could well succeed, we must say: If "Mohammed had succeded, Christianity, unless upheld by a

"divine force, would have inevitably perished."[27] Survey the historical situation. Arabia, Syria, Persia and Palestine quickly succumbed to the blows of Islam. From Africa it pressed onward victoriously into Spain, France and Italy. Asia Minor, Greece, and the Greek Empire fell with a crash. The Balkan States and Hungary capitulated. In 1683 the Islam host appeared before the gates of Vienna. And now? Who is afraid of the "sick man" now? Had not the nations been wrangling over the distribution of the spoils, his life, in Europe at least, would have long since been crushed out. But Islam, even viewed scientifically, is fast approaching dissolution. Not only is the bond that holds together the some 60 sects, into which it is broken up, extremely loose, but Rationalism and Pantheism have battered its foundations. The Wachhabites in Arabia wish to restore Islam pure and simple, in all its unbending stiffness, without veneration of saints and Sufism (mysticism); but does not this alone show Islam's incapacity for culture and civilization?[28] In vain they hope for a Mahdi, a Messias. Their messianic ideas are even baser than those of the degenerate sons of Israel. Islam can never revive again, can never become a true universal religion.

27 Pascal, *Pensées*, xvii. 7.
28 Kuenen, p. 49 seq.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY.

Christians are the disciples of Christ. From Him they derive their name. Christianity is an institution founded by Christ, professing the doctrines that He preached. "At Antioch the disciples were first named Christians."* This is the easiest and simplest answer to the questions: What is Christianity? and whence comes it? That Jesus Christ lived, that He died in the reign of Tiberius; that the great religion called Christianity began with Him, are facts that no earnest-minded enquirer now calls in question. Hence there is no need to offer proof for these points, seeing that no one denies them. Even were the testimony of Holy Scripture not unimpeachable, the history of the first three centuries would shatter every objection. But the problem we propose to unravel is more difficult. We are not concerned with the bare historical fact of the origin of Christianity. But we are to assign to Christianity its true place in the history of religion, to probe its origin, to examine how it arose, and how far it was swayed by existing ideas and influences. And first we shall set forth the verdict of men who, though outside the pale of Christianity, lived near the time when it first saw the light. The Talmud tries as far as possible to ignore the unpleasant fact, and merely records some silly and hateful fables about Christ and the

* Acts xi. 26.

Mineans. But, besides the Talmud, there are four notable writers: One Jew, Flavius Josephus, and three pagans: Tacitus, Suetonius, and Pliny the Younger.

In his work on Jewish antiquities, written about the year 94 A.D., Josephus thus writes:[1] "At that time there lived "Jesus, a wise man, if, indeed, we may call him a man. For he "was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of men who were "willing to receive the truth. He drew about him many "Jews, and also many heathens. He was the Messias. And "when, on the accusation of our chief men, Pilate con-"demned him to be crucified, those, who had before loved "him, did not abandon him. For on the third day he "again appeared to them alive; and the prophets had fore-"told this, and many other wonderful things concerning him. "Even now the race of Christians, who are called after him, "has not yet died out." This passage is quoted first by Eusebius,[2] and afterwards by Christian writers generally. Eusebius had previously cited a beautiful passage from Josephus on John the Baptist, in which the defeat of Herod, in his expedition against Aretas, the king of Arabia, is represented as a judgment of God on him for his murder of John. For, says Josephus, John was an excellent man, who moved the Jews to virtue, and baptized them in justice

[1] 'Ιουδαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία, Antiquitates Judaicae l. XVIII, c. 3, nr. 3: Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον 'Ιησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνήρ, εἴγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή. Ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδονῇ τἀληθῆ δεχομένων· καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν 'Ιουδαίους, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο. Ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν. Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἵ γε πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες. Ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων. Εἰσέτι τε νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὠνομασμένων οὐκ ἔκλιπε τὸ φῦλον.

[2] *Histor. Eccles.* I, 11. *Demonstr. Evangel.* III, 5.

to one another, and piety to God. His baptism did not remit sin, but served as an outward sign of inward purity of soul, and as a symbol of union.[3] Eusebius ends his quotation with the remark: "This is related of John the "Baptist and Our Saviour by a writer of Jewish descent. "What excuse, then, can there be for those who have been "convicted of impudently inventing stories about him?"

In modern times the genuineness of the passage on Jesus has, on internal grounds, been fiercely challenged. And, in truth, it ill accords with the spirit of Josephus. The truth of Christ's divine mission and Messianic character, of his resurrection, and the consequent fulfilment of prophecies, are startling admissions in the mouth of one who was a Pharisee and a friend of the Romans. For Josephus, as a rationalist, and not merely in deference to Vespasian and the Romans, had astutely eluded the Messianic prophecies. In the passage on John the Baptist he accentuates the moral character of John's preaching, without recognizing him as the forerunner of the Messias. To interpret the clause: "He was the Messias"[4] as expressing not Josephus' own opinion, but the popular belief, is to do violence both to the context and to history. Even the Gospels do not picture Jesus as the Messias in the sense that the Jewish people recognized Him as such. The attitude taken up by the Jews in the fourth Gospel, and the nature of Philo's Messianic idea forbids such an interpretation. A sceptical Jew of the higher classes, of the Josephus stamp, would rather have re-echoed the saying of the Jews: Not the Messias of the Jews, but he who said: I am the Messias of the Jews."[*] On the other hand Eusebius accepts this passage as unreservedly as the one on the Baptist. It is found in all the MSS., the oldest of which dates from the 11th century. So the passage cannot be wholly or in the main

3 *Antiq.* 18, 5. 2. See Schanz, *Commentar über das Evangelium des hl. Marcus*, Freiburg, 1881, p. 78.

4 Langen, *Judenthum*, p. 442.

* See John xix. 21.

an interpolation. It would indeed be surprising, if Josephus had passed over the subject in silence at a time when the second persecution of Christians under Domitian had broken out, and the "sect of Nazarenes" was generally known in Palestine. Total silence would be all the more inexplicable, as he gives an account of the martyrdom of James, whom he calls a brother of the so-called Christ.[5] To strike out this passage or the whole story as an invention of Jewish Christians[6] is an arbitrary proceeding. And yet the categorical expression in the first pasage is not above suspicion. The references to the accusations made against Jesus by the chiefs of the Jews, and to the tenacity with which the followers of Jesus clung to their master after his death, seem to hint at an older text. The passage vividly recalls the calumnies which, according to Justin, the Jews of Jerusalem were everywhere sowing broadcast,[7] and it recalls also the remark of Tacitus, that this abominable superstition had again broken out. A slight change could be easily introduced into the later MSS· The silence of the Fathers who lived before Eusebius is, indeed, a proof that the wording was not so emphatic as in the text of Eusebius.

Tacitus (54-119), when describing the horrors of the persecution of Christians under Nero, states[8] that the founder of Christians was put to death by Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor, in the reign of Tiberius. But, he goes on to say, after this corrupt superstition had been suppressed for the moment, it broke out afresh, not only in Judæa, its birthplace, but also in Rome, where all that is crazy and shameful, from whatever quarter it come, is honoured.

Suetonius (75-160)[9] mentions disturbances that broke out

5 20, 9, 1. Τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου χριστοῦ.

6 Keim, *Leben Jesu von Nasara*, III. 12. Schürer, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1874, p. 286. For the literature for and against the authenticity see *ibid.* and Hettinger, *Fundamentaltheologie*, I. p. 296. See also Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung in das Neu Estament.* Leipzig, 1875, p. 526. Friedlich, *Das Leben Jesu Christi.* Münster, 1887. p. 280.

7 See the quotations given in vol. I. p. 22. Note 4. For text and explanation see Aberle-Schanz, *Einleitung in das N.T.* Freiburg, 1877, p. 22.

8 *Annales*, XV. 44.

9 *Vita Claudii* c. 25. *Vita Neronis* c. 16.

Among the Roman Jews, *impulsore Chresto*, probably about the year 50, and ended in their banishment. In another passage he describes the Christians, whom Nero persecuted, as a race of men addicted to a new and baneful superstition. That the name *Chrestus* is another form of *Christus* (Itacism) admits of no doubt. Justin, though better informed, derives the name *Christian* from χρηστός. Tertullian relates that Christians were called *Chrestiani* by the heathen, and Lactantius says that the term *Chrestus* owed its origin to ignorance.[10] Anyhow, be the cause of these disputes political or religious, Chrestus was certainly the name of the individual Christ, and not merely a generic designation for the Messias. Surely it is more natural to refer the *Chrestus* of Suetonius to the historic Christ, than to strain one's eyesight in order to see in it "a Jewish agitator in Rome who actually bore this name."[11] Jewish Christians, as we know, were also included in the decree of banishment.* Grätz, *more suo*, represents this agitator as "a Christian apostle, named Christ."[12]

Pliny, the governor of Bithynia, shall close this series of witnesses. In a letter to the emperor Trajan, written about the year 110, Pliny states that his policy had been to set at liberty all persons accused of being Christians who consented to profess faith in the gods, to sacrifice to the genius of the emperor and to idols, and to curse Christ. But, he adds, no genuine Christian can be induced to do any of these things. The Christians had informed him that on certain days they assembled before sunrise, and sang hymns of praise to Christ their God.[13]

These testimonies of Jewish and Pagan writers go back to the second half of the 1st century, and leave no loophole for doubt, that a general knowledge of the person and life of Jesus had at

10 Justin, *Apol.* I. 4. Tertullian, *Apol.* 3, *ad. nat.* I. 3. Lactant. iv. 7. Clemens Alex., *Strom.* II. 4. Compare Hug, *Einleitung*, 4 ed. II. 335. *Katholik*, 1878, I. p. 269 seq.

11 Meyer, *Römerbrief*, 5 ed. Göttingen, 1872, p. 27, Note 1. K. Schmidt, *Die Anfänge des Christenthums in der Stadt Rom*. 1879, p. 15.

12 *Geschichte des Judenthums*, 3 ed. 1878, III. 392.

13 Ep. 10, 96.

* Acts xviii. 1.

that time penetrated even into non-Christian circles. Tacitus in mentioning the time of Christ's death supplies at least a *terminus ad quem*. Scanty as these references are, they witness to the fact that Christianity, named after Christ, its founder, was striking root as a *new* religion in the Greek and Roman world.

The sacred writers give fuller details about the origin of Christianity. Jesus represents his teaching as not his own, but as his Father's in heaven who sent him. He insists that the same obedience must be yielded to his commandments as God in the Old Testament required for the law. To the Apostles it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, and they acknowledged him as their Lord and Master. In Christ, God gave the highest revelation to mankind*; him the disciples are to hear.† But apart from these testimonies in their own behalf, the founding of Christianity, which is incontestably associated with the person of Jesus, cannot be accounted for in any other way. The only conceivable alternative would be to suppose that the solution of the religious question was contained in the nature and character of the pre-existing religious development, and that Jesus, with the keen intuition of an enlightened prophet, philosopher and theosophist, with the help of Jewish and heathen doctrines, merely brought it to a final issue and termination. It behoves us, therefore, to see whether from a religious and historical point of view Christianity may be accounted for in this way.

Celsus the Jew thus taunted Christians: "How can you, who "go forth from our sanctuaries, despise them? For you can "point to no other origin of your doctrine, than our law." To this Origen replies: "The sanctuaries of the Mosaic law and "the writings of the prophets are, indeed, the basis of the "Christian religion, and the initiated grow in the knowledge "and understanding of the Scriptures by seeking the mystery,

24 Orig., *c. Cels.* II. 4.
* Hebrews I. 1.
† Matthew XVII. 5.

"which was hidden from eternity, but which has now been "revealed by the teaching of the prophets, and by the mani- "festation of our Lord Jesus Christ. But it is untrue, as you "say, that those who advance despise the law of Moses. On "the contrary they load it with honour by showing the depth of "wise and unutterable words contained therein. All this was "hidden from the Jews because, in reading the Scriptures, they "remained on the surface, and clung to fables. Why is it "foolish, if the law is the principle of our faith or gospel? For "as our Lord said to those who did not believe in him; If you "believe Moses, you would also believe in me, for concerning "me he wrote. If you believe not his Scriptures, how shall you "believe my words? But Mark, one of the Evangelists, says: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; as it is written "in the prophet Isaias . . . . And he thereby teaches "that Christianity began with the Jewish Scriptures. What "then is this reproach that the Jew Celsus is hurling at us, "when he says: If any one foretold that the Son of God was to "appear among men, it was a prophet of ours and of our God. "Is it an argument against Christianity that John, who baptized "Jesus, was a Jew? For it does not follow that everyone who "believes, be he Jew or Gentile, must observe the letter of the "law of Moses."

To this exposition of Origen there is little to add. It glistens with allegorical interpretations of Scripture, but the connection of Christianity with Judaism is undeniable. We are not here speaking of an external connection; for that Jesus came of a Jewish stock, was brought up in the ordinances of the law, and became a model to others, may be read in the story of the sacred infancy in St. Luke's Gospel. Here it is a question of an internal connection of doctrine and morals. This, too, Jesus and the Apostles not only repeatedly recognised but expressly declared. They regarded the Old Testament as a revelation from God, which not only prepared the way for the New Covenant, the revelation in the Son, but also contained it

in germ. Here we need only quote the more important words in which Jesus clearly defined his attitude to the Old Law. At the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount He says: "Do "you think that I am come to destroy the law or the Prophets. "I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For amen I say unto "you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot, or one tittle shall not "pass of the law, till all be fulfilled. He therefore that shall "break one of these least commandments, and shall so teach "men, shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven. "But he that shall do and teach, he shall be called great in the "Kingdom of Heaven."* From this it would seem that Jesus merely designed to restore to a place of honour the original law and the prophets. This view seems to gain strength from the fact that Jesus repeatedly requires that even the ceremonial law be fulfilled.[16] Is Jesus then merely reproaching the Jews for burdening the law with Pharisaical glosses and human traditions, when he continues: "For I tell you, that unless your justice "abound more than that of the Scribes and Pharisees you shall "not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." On these grounds many commentators think that the Sermon on the Mount, which Matthew saw reason for casting in this mould, and placing first in his account of our Lord's public life, is merely an anti-Pharisaical manifesto. Some parts of the sermon seem to countenance this view, but not so in the main. There the old law is so formally and forcibly contrasted with the new, and the old law-giver with the authority of Jesus, that the point of the comparison lies precisely in the contrast, as appears from the various instances which are sometimes literally quoted. Doubtless, as the sermon advances, the knife is set to Pharisaical excrescences. But this excision is so plainly a corollary of the main position taken up, that it cannot annul the leading idea, which is so well expressed by S. John: "The law was

15 Math. v. 23; vii. 23; xiii. 41; xxi. 12; xxiii. 28; xix. 17; xxii. 34 seq. See *ibid.* xix. 28 seq; xx. 20 seq. Mark x. 35, seq.

* Matthew v., 17-19.

"given by Moses, grace and truth by Jesus Christ."* The spirit of the law is of far greater import than the letter. External observances go for little, unless the spirit and heart be animated by holy dispositions. Thoughts, desires and looks are as reprehensible as outward acts. The tree must be changed, for none but a good tree can bring forth good fruit. Men do not put a new piece on an old garment, or pour new wine into old bottles. The rejection of the deceitful gift,† the indifference towards unclean meats,‡ and the former fast of the Jews§ may be anti-Pharisaical; but what is said about true purity of heart and right intention in fasting is already a step in advance of the law. Anyhow, in his subsequent principal utterances, Christ set aside the formal law in favour of a new spirit, and proclaimed himself the Lord of the Law and the Sabbath. Thus the statement of Renan and others that "early Christianity is pure and simple Judaism," is distinctly untrue.

In common with the prophets Jesus says: I will have mercy and not sacrifice;|| like the prophets he requires first and chiefly that all shall worship the one true God. In his prayer to his Father in heaven he declares that in this consists eternal life that they honour thee the one true God; and then he adds: and him whom thou hast sent.** Jesus, as the Messianic prophets foretold, came to fulfil the law and the prophets. Men need a new heart and a new spirit to fulfil the law, and to worship God in spirit and in truth. The purely preparatory enactments of the law had fulfilled their purpose, and become obsolete. When the Messias had come, the others were invested with a higher motive and end.†† The law was written on the tablets of man's heart; but the Spirit of God is the lamp to his feet,

* John i. 17.
† Matt. xv. 5.
‡ Ibid xv. 11.
§ Ibid ix. 14.
|| Matt. ix. 3; xii. 7; Mark xii. 33.
** John xvii. 3.
†† On the various ways in which the Old Law may be fulfilled, the reader may usefully consult S. Thomas I. II. Q. 100-105. *Tr.*

and his strength in the journey through life. Our Lord himself applied this principle to the Sabbath. On higher moral grounds he set himself above it; for as nature and man's sanctification are above the positive law; as the Sabbath is for man, and not man for the Sabbath, so the Son of Man is lord also the Sabbath.* As the Father worketh until now, so also the Son.† But the new law could not take effect till the spirit had been sent. For a time, the disciples continued faithfully to observe the Jewish law as far as possible. S. Peter needed a special revelation before he would receive the heathen Cornelius into the Church. The promise to the heathen, and above all S. Paul's divinely enlightened insight into the Old Testament, brought about a radical change; and the Gentile Christians were bound to observe none but the four commands prescribed by the Apostolic Council. But these soon fell into disuse. S. Paul leavened the whole law with a new spirit by explaining the Old Testament allegorically, and even historical events typically.‡ In this way he was enabled, on the one hand, to declare that the entire spirit and riches of the doctrine of Christ had been prefigured in the Old Testament, and on the other hand to represent Christianity as the end of the law,§ as a new doctrine, a new truth, as the kingdom of grace, not of the law. The Law is good and holy;‖ but the believer is not under the law, but under grace. The law is a pedagogue to Christ, but when faith is come, we are no longer under tutors;** the law was given for the increase of sins.[16] The distinction between letter and spirit, sufficiently explains the points of contact and divergence; but the new spirit and the deep meaning were first

16 Rom. iv, 15; v, 20; vii, 13; Gal. iii, 10, 13, 19, 22. See Kuhn, *Einleitung in die Kath. Dogmatik*, 2 Ed. Tübingen 1859. p. 23.

* John v, 17.

† Mark ii, 28.

‡ I Cor. x, 1; Galat. iv, 22

§ Rom. x, 4.

‖ Ibid. vii, 10-12.

** Galat. iii, 25.

revealed by Christ.[17] Jesus gave his disciples a new commandment, new in sense and spirit, of brotherly love, of love of our neighbour. So the Old Testament is not a mere prophecy, nor the New a mere fulfilment; nor is the difference simply one of "saving grace, as if in Christianity a purely spiritual and moral "sanctification had replaced the purely natural sanctification "of the religion of Israel.[18] The first view ignores the deep distinction between the two Testaments, while the second exaggerates it. Of course Christianity is not an absolutelv new religion, since it has grown on Jewish soil, and envelops and completes the religious truths contained in the Old Testament, but it stands far above Judaism, whether viewed in its narrow-mindedness and antagonism to progress, or as a preparation for Christianity. Apologists, in battling against dualistic gnosticism, often exaggerated the agreement between the two Testaments, but they did not overlook the changes which Christianity, as an universal religion, carried within its bosom, and was, in course of time, to bring forth.

And now, having considered the formal aspect of the question, we may pass over to the material. It will not be difficult to show in detail, how far Christianity surpasses the Old Testament both in doctrine and in practice. In the words addressed to the woman at Jacob's well, our Lord himself indicated universality as the distinguishing characteristic of the Christian religion: "Woman believe me, that the hour cometh, when you "shall neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem adore the "Father."* It is true, no doubt, that the Old Testament, in the Psalms and in the Prophets, also, in some measure, implies universality; but it was precisely a prophetic announcement having reference only to the Messianic times.

The prophets foretold that, in the days of the Messias, there would be an universal faith and worship, and that a pure

17 John xiii. 34. I John ii. 7; II John 5.
18 Stade, *Theol. Lit. Zeitung*, 1887. No. 9. Col. 199.
* John, iv. 21.

unspotted sacrifice would be offered to Jahve's name in every place. But Israel could never rise to the level of its prophets. Now, a gospel that should embrace the whole human race is essentially distinct from a mere resuscitation of the prophetic office in a higher form, although the foundations of that gospel were really laid by the prophets. Again, there is a difference between our Lord's description of universality and that of the prophets. They, when speaking from a Messianic standpoint, contemplate the people collectively, while Jesus is solicitious for the spiritual and eternal welfare of each and every individual soul. In the dispersion, again, the Jewish religion remained restricted to Jews. Proselytism was but an after-thought. To represent the proselytising tendency of later Judaism as the bridge from a natural to a universal religion is, to say the least, grossly to exagerate its importance. As a stepping-stone it may stand; as a bridge it breaks down.

Celsus' typical Jew is made to scoff at the inferiority of the gospel teaching. The Christian doctrines on the resurrection of the body, on the last judgment, on eternal rewards and punishments are, each in turn, held up as a butt for scorn and ridicule. He thought, says Origen, by affixing to Christian doctrines the stigma of poverty, that is, as having nothing new, to deal Christianity a deadly blow.[30] But, as the same Father observes, it is truer to say that Jesus, seeing that the Jews were unworthy of the prophets, taught in parables that God would take away the kingdom from them and give it to the Gentiles. For this reason, he continues, the Jews put their trust in fables and follies, because they have not light to understand the Scriptures. But Christians have inherited the truth which elevates their minds and hearts, and transports them to higher spheres. The truth has brought home to them that their city is in heaven, not on earth like that of the Jews. Christianity is in very truth universal, because its Jerusalem is of heaven not of earth, and because it is a spiritual religion without local

30 *C. Celsum*, ii. 5.

boundaries. Hence Christ, filled with the spirit from above, was the first to preach the kingdom of heaven, and to shed light on the dark sayings of the prophets. The doctrines of the resurrection, the last judgment, and the immortality of the soul, Christ has set on that firm foundation, which is so necessary to faith, if it is to hold its own against all foes from within and without. The goal for which all are to strive, is the heavenly Jerusalem; and Christ, the Saviour of all men, has gone before to show the way.

All this applies with still greater force to the mysteries of Christianity. What God had prepared from all eternity for men that love him, eye had not seen, nor ear heard, nor had it entered into the heart of man to conceive till God revealed it by His Spirit who searcheth all things, even the deep things of God. But to us he hath revealed it, as S. Paul expressly teaches, by His Spirit.* We have not received the spirit of the world, but the Spirit of God, to know what God hath given us. This is what Jesus Christ taught concerning the revelation of the mystery which was hidden from eternity, but is now revealed in the Scriptures of the prophets. †

The Incarnation is the central doctrine of Christianity. On it, the doctrine of redemption and grace rests. The Fathers loved, not without reason, to argue from the work of redemption to the person of Christ and his two natures. On the one hand they held fast to the conviction that Christ had redeemed only what he had assumed. Hence against Gnostics and Manichæans, they maintained that Jesus was truly man, and against Arians, Appollinarists and Monothelites, that he had assumed an entire and perfect human nature. Being likewise equally convinced that none but a God can liberate sinful humanity from sin and death and the slavery of the devil, and satisfy the infinite justice of God, they upheld the perfect godhead of Christ with all their might. We look in vain for this central

* I. Cor. II. 7—10.

† Romans, XVI. 25.

dogma in Judaism. The prophets, it is true, depict the Messias as the Man of sorrows, as well as the King of Heaven, and the Son of God. They describe the Son of Man appearing in the clouds of heaven. These, however, are but a meagre outline of the glorious picture of the Incarnation in its fulness. Of themselves, the greatest prophets could not have united these various features in the Word made flesh. Without the living example before their eyes this belief could never have won disciples. To the Jews this was the great stumbling-block in the teaching of Jesus. In the appeal to his Father they detected a blasphemy, because he, being a man, made himself equal to God. Again, they adjudged him guilty of blasphemy because he described himself as the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven. Philo, than who no one knew better how to idealize the Old Testament and to adapt it to Greek ideas, was so far from believing in an incarnation that such an idea finds no place in his system. Later Jewish Theology, the Talmud, and the Kabbala, are equally silent on the subject. How then could Christ and the Apostles have evolved this chief and fundamental tenet of Christianity from the Old Testament?

To contend that the doctrine of the Incarnation was foreign to primitive Christianity, is to remove the stumbling-block indeed, but only at the cost of being directly at variance with Scripture and Tradition. He who bolsters up such a contention utterly fails to grasp the intrinsic force of Christianity, and furthermore credits later times with a constructive power of religious development greater than that possessed by Christ and the Apostles. For the Incarnation is not an abstract theorem, but a living force imparting solidity, strength and support to Christian life. The God-man, who is ever abiding and working in his Church, is the spring whence Christian life flows. Salvation consists in the union of the faithful with the incarnate Son of God. The Jews regard the Messias as the mighty, wise and just King, who will bring glory and prosperity to Israel. None but the just, who have been proved worthy by their obedience

to the law, will have a share in the Messianic Kingdom. But the Christian Messias, the God-man, humbled himself and took the form of a servant in order, by becoming obedient even to the death of the Cross, to atone for man's disobedience. He had both the power and the will to set men free from this bond of sin. The divine Spirit is poured abroad on all who are united to the Messias in faith and charity. They are raised to a participation in the divine nature. Their sanctification and redemption centre in the person of the God-man, Christ, who rains down his grace on all living members of the Church which he has espoused.

Closely linked with the Incarnation, is the mystery of the Blessed Trinity, which is distinctly shadowed forth in the Old Testament. What is said about the Word of God in the Old Scriptures and the Psalms, makes no personal distinction between God and his Word. Even the descriptions in the book of Job are no more than a personification. A slight advance is discernible in the Sapiential Books which depict the increate wisdom, or wisdom created before all creatures, as an image and an out-pouring of the Divine Wisdom and glory, and identify it so closely with the divine act of Creation that, in the chief passages at least, the progress from personification to a real personality or hypostasis can hardly be denied. Still, what an immeasurable interval separates this from S. John's doctrine of the *Logos*, or even from the idea set forth in the earlier Pauline Epistles! The distinction of the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, is still more remarkable. From the very first the Spirit of God is mentioned in the Old Testament; but if his personality can be recognized by means of the New Testament, it does not follow that the same may be done from the standpoint of Mosaic Monotheism. The doctrine of the personality of the Holy Spirit was unfolded comparatively late, even in Christian Theology. "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the "Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" These

parting words of our Lord show what a sharp distinction exists between Christian triune Monotheism and Mosaic Monotheism, in which no hint, beyond a few plural forms, is given of a plurality of persons. Christian Monotheism is not excluded by the Mosaic, but is included in it; yet it was not evolved of itself, or by the intuition and reflection of man. It is possible, though difficult to prove, that the Jews may may have been nearer the doctrine of the Trinity at an earlier period than in the time of Christ. In any case, the Old Testament contains no similar formula that combines the plurality of persons with the unity of nature. Here it may be truly said that the discoverer would have been greater than the hero.

Jesus gives thanks to his Father for hiding these things from the wise and prudent, and revealing them to little ones. "All "things are declared to me by my Father. And no one know-"eth the Son but the Father; neither doth any one know the "Father but the Son, and he to whom it shall please the Son to "reveal him."* And S. John thus concludes his prologue: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son "who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."† Throughout the fourth Gospel the knowledge of the Son proceeds *pari passu* with the knowledge of the Father. Does not this very fact suggest that the Trinity was first revealed, in its perfection, in the Incarnation?

Law and doctrine are inseparable. Every truth in Holy Scripture is practical and adapted to life. Christian morality is as far above the dim foreshadowing in the Old Testament, as the Spirit is above the letter. Jewish morality (the Law), was, in its day, unequalled in purity, and incomparably superior[31] to heathen morality. But it is a gross exaggeration to say, that Christianity had only to give it a finishing touch to make it perfect. Greek, and, in part, Christian civilization is undeniably

31 Vigouroux, iii. 5.
* Math xi. 27.
† John i. 18.

indebted to the Semite. But it does not therefore follow that no notable distinction obtains between Jewish and Christian morality. It is quite true that the moral laws so-called, are all equally binding in the Christian dispensation. But then it must be remembered that, these laws do but positively formulate what is already written in the heart of man. The Decalogue is but the natural law, which God positively promulgated and sanctioned by His immediate authority, that it might no longer be liable to be misunderstood and obscured by man's sinful will and caprice. But in principle and for spiritual conception, the Decalogue in the New Testament out-distances the Old Testament. The charge formerly brought against Hebrew morality of being merely legal has now, as was just, been abandoned, but the opposite pitfall of endowing it with the Christian spirit has not been avoided. No one knew the law in theory and in practice better than S. Paul. Yet he it is, who has most emphatically declared that the external sanctity of works was the essential characteristic of the Old Law. The prophets did much to deepen the moral law. But the palm must be given to Isaias who, in the second part of his "Gospel" of the Old Testament, surpasses all the prophets in the sublimity and grandeur of his thoughts. It has been said, with some show of justice, that "in the, greatest of all the prophets, "the purification and spiritualization of Mosaism rises to a "height, that is not much below the religious summit to which "Christianity has mounted;"[22] but the prophetic and Messianic character of Isaias' "Gospel" should not be overlooked. Only in Jesus is Isaias' picture of the Servant of God fully and vividly realized.

We have already alluded to the love of God and our neighbour. In order to appreciate the full significance of this fundamental principle of Christian morality, we must take our stand in ancient times, when a haughty egotism was the only maxim

22 Pfleiderer, *Die Geschichte der Religion*, 22. 331. Fritz, *Aus antiker Weltanschauung*, p. 141. Compare also Kuenen, *Volksreligion*, p. 185, seq. with reference to the whole subject.

governing public and private life. Unless statecraft interfered, the poor man was despised and left to his fate. In the old heathen world, and even for the most part among the Jews, we seek in vain for those works of mercy and charity done for God's sake, which are generally known as Christian virtues, although the words of the first commandment are taken from the Jewish writings. The law commanded that the poor, the widows and orphans were to be supported. A certain equality was restored by the Jubilee year. Slaves—Jewish slaves—might hope for freedom, and foreigners had mercy shewn to them. Even dumb animals benefited by the law, They, too, were to rest on the Sabbath. They were protected against cruelty and ill-usage. But, without discounting the effect of these laws in their actual working, they are still an immeasurable distance from the sublime morality of the Sermon on the Mount. What an immense interval separates the love of kindred from the love shewn by the Samaritan, from the love of all men, even an enemy! There are, it is true, a few faint vestiges,[23] but no more, of the love of one's enemy in the Old Law. Thus the Jews were forbidden to starve an enemy's beast, to molest foreigners, to carry the *Jus Talionis* to excess, that is, to take the law of retaliation into their own hands; and they were counselled to succour an enemy in need. Is not this the identical love of enemies inculcated in the New Testament? Undoubtedly it is a partial assertion of the principle. But when we come to consider the so-called "Psalms of revenge" or, as they are sometimes less reverently styled, the cursing Psalms, hostility towards the enemies of God, the heathen, is clearly seen to be a self-evident principle. Only private revenge was forbidden, as vengeance belonged to God. It is no purpose of ours to drag down the Old Testament from its moral altitude, being fully aware that the law was framed for the Jews according to their hardness of heart; but in view of the attempt to merge Judaism into Christianity, we are bound to accentuate the essential differences.

23 Exod. xxiii. 4. 5. 9. Prov. xx. 22; xxiv. 17. 29; xxv. 21. 22.

Again, the motives by which Christians are moved to love God and their neighbour, are of a much higher order. As already explained, the Old Testament lays stress on rewards and punishments, on earthly blessings and maledictions. In the New Testament, Jesus requires His disciples to exchange the mammon of iniquity for heavenly treasures, and to sell all, and give to the poor that they may have treasure in heaven. Christians surrender earthly riches and possessions that they may save souls—their own souls and the souls of others. This is their highest motive of action. "Save thy soul," is the dominant note of Christian preaching, the chief duty imposed on a Christian. Zeal for the salvation of souls enkindled the divine heart of Jesus with a desire to accomplish it, and he so set on fire the hearts of the Apostles that they were prepared to make the greatest sacrifices for this end. The soul of every man, be he most abject, whether a beggar, a slave, or an enemy, is stamped with the likeness of the Blessed Trinity. To save it is the noblest work of a Christian. All else is as refuse, except to know Christ, who has redeemed all men, and made them children of God and heirs of eternal life. If the soul is inflamed with this fire of divine charity, it will not only guard against scandalizing one of these little ones, but it will also be disposed to renounce earthly goods and pleasures, and to submit its will in all things to the Divine Will. The "evangelical counsels," which are not found in the Old Testament, give a lovely bloom to the heavenly spirit of loving God and our neighbour. In them is fulfilled the word of the Apostle, that our conversation is in heaven. They also show that natural development is out of the question. *Natura non facit saltum*, is an axiom common to ancient and modern philosophers alike. Neither does the spiritual life or man's historical development proceed by leaps and bounds. Man can cure his egotism and love of earthly things only by rising from the natural to a supernatural order, from a lower to a higher revelation. It is by the spirit of God that charity is poured abroad[24] into the

24 Compare Moehler, *Gesammelte Schriften*, i. 251, seq.

hearts of men; by the God-man all men have been made the children of God.

Now the love of God and our neighbour is the fulfilling of the whole Law.* It sanctifies the whole of life, especially married life and virginity. Christ restored marriage to its primitive purity, by forbidding divorce, and by restoring monogamy as instituted by God in creation. In this matter, as our Lord pointed out, the Old Testament made many concessions to human weakness. The Jewish Law permitted divorce, and ordered a bill of divorce, on humane grounds, to be made out. But, although the man was empowered to dismiss the woman, the woman could not dismiss the man. Jesus withdrew this concession that had been made to the hard-heartedness of the Jews. He enjoined that husbands and wives should be faithful to one another, and that Christian marriage, even in thought and desire, should be indissoluble. How earnestly the Apostles preached mutual love and devotion to married people! How emphatically they point to the higher moral end of married life, to the eternal home, where people neither marry nor are given in marriage! In his work on the priesthood, S. Chrysostom has preserved a beautiful address of his mother, who wished to deter him from leaving his father's house, and from consecrating himself, along with his friend Basil, to the religious life. She reminds her son in particular that, although young, she had not married again, in order that she might be able to devote herself wholly to educating him.[25] The rhetorician Libanius, the tutor of S. Chrysostom, one day asked whose son John was. To the question, how old is his mother? he received for answer, forty years. And how long has she been a widow? Twenty years, was the reply. Thereupon the heathen exclaimed in astonishment: What women these Christians have![26]

Both Our Lord and S. Paul rank virginity higher than

25 I. 2. 11 seq.

26 Chrysost., *Ad viduam juniorem.* Comp. Seltmann, *Des heil. Chrysostomus de sacerdotio* ll. 6, p. 22.

* Galatians v. 14; Romans iii. 8 9.

marriage. No such phenomenon occurs in the Old Testament. Children were esteemed the greatest of blessings. In some other nations the position of virgins was held in high honour. But, concerning the Jews, we only know that while setting great store by the bodily integrity of the bride, they regarded marriage as a duty imposed on each and all. The command to "increase and multiply" was looked upon as strictly binding on the community, and on individuals. Barrenness was reckoned the greatest misfortune, and a sort of shame attached to it. But the Apostle says: He that is without a wife is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God; the unmarried woman and the virgin thinketh on the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit.* Chastity is a duty for all whose body is a temple of the Holy Ghost; but it is only a preliminary to the sanctification of the whole life of man. Virginity is spiritual as well as corporal, and not corporal merely, as with the Vestal Virgins. It is a renunciation of the world for God's sake for the better sanctification of the soul; a renewal in spirit, in order to give undivided service to God and our neighbour. And it looks to the noble example of Our Lord, by whom the new man was created in "justice and holiness of truth."†

The love of God and our neighbour leads to humility, the groundwork of the Christian virtues. As sin began with pride and opposition to God, so redemption began by the Son of God emptying and humbling himself. The fear of the Lord, humility in the presence of God, and confidence in God in the hour of need, all, indeed, find a place in the Old Testament. But man's consciousness of his own infirmity and helplessness, and his unbounded trust in God, so characteristic of Christian humility, were impossible before Christianity, which looks upon the external fulfilment of the Law as valueless unless accompanied by inward dispositions of soul. Jesus expressly rejects all alms, fasting and prayer, done for ostentation. In the

* I. Cor. vii. 32-34.
† Ephes. iv. 24.

Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, he has drawn a sharp contrast between proud self-justification, and upright humble self-knowledge. "This doctrine of humility is so fraught with "consequences for us, that we have none other for our instructor, "but our great Redeemer Himself.[27] "Learn of me for I am meek and humble of heart, and you shall find rest." Was such a model of humility in existence before the Incarnation? In Isaias: but in his picture of the future Messias. So we have again veered round to the point from which we started. In the Incarnation, the central mystery of Christianity, the rays of doctrine and practice meet, and find their explanation; in it we behold the new standard that Christianity has set up. Unless the seeds sown in the Old Testament had been watered by this new revelation, they would never have blossomed and borne fruit.

It is hardly necessary to add that Jesus did not acquire his doctrine in Jewish schools. By the testimony of his opponents, Jesus had received no regular schooling.[28] Lowly Galilee gave him no facilities for studying the religious tendencies of the age, nor even the religious strife of Jewish parties. When first he appeared in public he was a perfect man, showing a knowledge and ability unwarranted by the antecedents of his youth. When a boy of twelve years he astonished the assembly of scribes! At the outset his doctrine and manner of preaching were unlike those either of the mild Hillel or the rigorous Schammai. He taught as one having power, and not as the scribes. To say that the striking Sermon on the Mount represents the Haggada, or popular method, as opposed to the Halacha, or method of the scribes, is to hazard an explanation that is hardly skin-deep. The contrast lay deeper. It was a spiritual contrast between truth and error, light and darkness, life and death. In their sinful political strifes, the Jews denied the principle of their religion, the expectation of the Messias.*

27 Orig., c. *Celsum* vi. 15 Matt. xi. 29.
28 John vii. 15. Luke ii. 47.
* John xix. 15

In their blind zeal for the law, their understanding was darkened. They had zeal for God, but not "according to knowledge."* The casuistry of the Talmud was, indeed, written later; but the traditions therein go back to the times before Christ. Our Lord said of the Pharisees: they strain at gnats and swallow camels. The passages raked out of Hillel and other heads of schools, as parallels to the teaching of Jesus, conclusively prove such an origin of Christianity to be impossible. The Talmud may contain phrases similar and almost identical with those in the Sermon on the Mount, but they are isolated, and are so interleaved with trivial sayings and absurd anecdotes that, neither in their form nor meaning, can they compare with the teaching of Jesus, at once so simple, so profound, and so majestic. Modern Rabbis are at pains to collect a number of beautiful passages, in order to show that the morality of the Gospel and the Talmud are one and the same; but they omit to account for their connection, and to treat the subject as a connected and organic whole. Nor does the casuistry of the Talmud supply the missing link. The Gospel and the Talmud find, indeed, a point of union in the Old Testament, but they are two very different branches of the same trunk. Just as the Apocryphal Gospels help us to appreciate the sublimity of the Canonical Gospels, so the Talmud is all the more apt to bring home to the reader the contrast between it and the spirit that pervades the New Testament. Even when Jesus suits his words to the capacity of his hearers, and speaks in parables and similitudes to the weak and little ones, his preaching always bears a divine impress.

There is, perhaps, some slight resemblance between the morality of the Essenes and that preached by Jesus. The Essenes, dissatisfied with the service of the Temple, set up an opposition worship of a silent and peaceful kind, in retirement from the world. Thus, as far as in them lay, they rendered an universal religion impossible. But theirs was essentially an

* Rom. x. 2.

external worship. They sought justification in external ablutions and purifications, in abstention from wine and flesh-meat, and, in part, from marriage. But Jesus held up the mirror of internal purity and redemption from sin, as the indispensable preliminaries to a holy life. "The "Essenes aimed at being God-fearing Jews. They saw "that the Law was but one step in the ladder of God's "training of the human race, and that to the sacrifice of "blood must succeed a better and more spiritual service "of God." But they inaugurated no religious movement in Palestine. It is not known that Jesus conversed with them. They are not once mentioned in the New Testament. Their schismatical action and factious opposition to the lawful high-priest, outweigh what little resemblance there may be in regard to oaths and brotherly love. Essenism, therefore, either in itself, or as an element in Eastern religious influences (whether Buddhistic, Iranian, or aught else), cannot be regarded as a stepping-stone to Christianity. And, although it neither has been, nor can be proved that these Eastern religions exercised any influence in Palestine, yet it is very probable that the thunderings of Christianity had reverberated among Philo's Egyptian Therapeutæ. But the breach is too wide to be filled in by Philo's Hellenism. Philo himself inclines more to Hellenism than to Christianity.

Have not Christian faith and morals been influenced by heathen thought? And is not the advance that the New Testament makes on the Old sufficiently accounted for by such influences? As we have already seen, S. Augustine and those Fathers who had been trained in Greek philosophy, inclined to the opinion that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity were common to religions before Christ. They held that the truths about God, the creation, judgment of the world, and the moral claims of conscience were the common property of human reason, and originated in the invisible operations of the *Eternal Logos*. Origen twitted Celsus, with arguing that every

admirable truth is common to Christians and Greeks.[30] And he continues: Doctrines, sound in theory and profitable, by whomsoever enunciated—whether by Plato or any of the wise men of Greece, by Moses or the prophets, by Christ or the Apostles—should not be repudiated by Jews and Christians merely because the heathen also assent to them. For, be it remembered, the Jewish Scriptures are older than Greek literature. But, as a rule, the Fathers looked too much askance at other religions to be able to investigate in what relation they stood to the Old and New Testaments. But Origen censured Celsus for placing Chaldæans, Egyptians, Persians and Hindus on a higher level than the Jews, in the teeth of the fact that these peoples were steeped in damnable idolatries and shameful immoralities.

The assertions of Celsus have been readily re-echoed by modern religious historians, who look with a favourable eye on the theory that these religions were an influential factor, not in the Old Testament only, but also in the formation of Christianity. Bunsen has called into requisition the Iranian, and Burnouf the Hindu religions. And now Buddhism is being largely pressed into service. In sketching the history of religion, we pointed out that, though certain resemblances (e.g., the Iranian teaching about Ormuzd and the resurrection) are undeniable, they do but glide on the surface of the Christian doctrine without touching its essence. The Hindu doctrine of an incarnation, which at most is but an indwelling, cannot have given birth to the Christian, seeing that it is hostile to theism and friendly to pantheism. The very essence of the Incarnation is wanting. The translations of unripe Indian scholars[31] are responsible for the extravagant notions that have prevailed. "We "must not look in the original belief of mankind for Christian "ideas, but for the fundamental religious ideas on which

30 *C. Cels.* vii. 59; vi. 80. In like manner Clement of Alex. See Kuhn, *Theol. Quart.* 1839, p. 28 seq. Denzinger, II. 38.

31 See M. Müller, *Religionswissenschaft*, especially as regards Lieutenant Wilford and Jacolliot.

"Christianity is built; without which, as its natural and historical "support, Christianity could never have become what it is."[30] Reason was always, in a certain sense, Christian. Primitive revelation could never be wholly effaced; but for reasons, ethnological and historical, took deepest root in the East. Is it then surprising that it has fetched shrill echoes from the hollow earth? But it cannot thence be argued that they were the very sap of Christianity, or that they were the seed from which Christianity has grown. External resemblances and internal connections show a common religious groundwork and nothing more. To conclude off-hand that the doctrines are the same, and that one is dependent on the other, rests on an argument from false analogy of comparative theology. At first blush the superficial sameness takes away the breath. But the resemblance is merely apparent, for the principles at bottom are radically distinct.

The same must be said of Buddhism, which is now being diligently ransacked in the hope that it may prove the source from which Christianity has flowed. The chief proof on which this theory leans is not the so-called Buddhistic doctrine of the Trinity, but the character of Buddha which in several points is supposed to resemble that of Jesus. Buddhistic and Christian moral precepts are in many respects similar. For the Buddhistic moral code inculcates humiliation and self-denial and a certain renunciation of the world; all of which are, as a rule, unknown to other heathens. The same may be said of monasticism and prayer, of sanctuaries and sacrifices for the dead, or ancestor-worship as it exists in China. These practices are remarkably akin to the corresponding Christian institutions.

The sketch of Buddha's life, given above, reveals, however, many dissimilarities with the life of Jesus. Buddha, to begin with, though predestined by the counsel of the gods, is born of a prince and marries! He could not, like Jesus, appeal in all things to the will of his Father. He retires from the world,

30 M. Müller, *Wissenschaft der Sprache* II. 395.

and blights the hope of heaven; whereas Jesus comes to the world, acts upon it, and goes in search of the lost sheep; he teaches men both by word and example to mortify themselves, and to renounce the world—not as an end in themselves, but as a means of gaining heaven. It is noteworthy that the very points of alleged similarity between Jesus and Buddha are precisely those which have been foretold or foreshadowed in the Old Testament; so that the coincidence must be purely accidental. So, again, the two moral systems are wholly different, both as to the end in view, and as to their motives. Self-seeking is the mainspring of a Buddhist's action. Renunciation of earthly goods, voluntary poverty, and self-denial in a monastery are intended to banish dull care and to prepare the mind for mysticism. Therein he is to seek his happiness free from all passion. The love of God is quite out of question, and the love of neighbours is required only as a negative motive, inasmuch as hatred would disturb tranquillity of soul. Moreover, ordinary men and women are incapable of soaring to such speculative heights, and thus Buddhistic bliss is for none but the elect, that is, monks. The Buddhist disentangles himself from earthly things and yearns for Nirvana, in order to be freed from the misery of existence. Christians, following the teaching and example of Jesus, renounce worldly goods, lest these should tempt them to forsake God, and thus cause them to lose eternal life. Worldly goods are, in their eyes, not something wicked, but a means of gaining heaven. What an abyss yawns between the two doctrines! For while the prospect of heaven, his true home, lights up the Christian soul with hope, the Buddhist's Nirvana shrouds it in the dark night of death.

The same great and wide difference divides them in their practical lives. A modern Japanese writer, hostile to Christianity, thus unburdens his soul. "Jesus teaches that in heaven "they will neither marry nor be given in marriage. Conse-"quently, there will be neither eating nor drinking. Such a life "is not worth living, and I care for the incorruptible crown as

"little as I fear eternal fire. Even if Jesus be the Son of God, "I had rather receive the severest punishment he can inflict, "than deviate, only by a hair's breadth, from the obedience I "owe to my parents and teachers."[33] Everyone will see from these words, how the noblest feature in the Christian religion, namely its spirituality and superiority to all things earthly, is utterly ignored. Paradise must be of the Mohammedan sort or not at all. The natural ties, good and legitimate in themselves, are preferred to God and heaven. Thus we clearly see that no heathen religion, not even Buddhism, can bridge over the abyss between heaven and earth, or span the gulf between time and eternity. In none do finite and infinite meet and embrace. The desires of the heart are not satisfied by the scores of statues of incarnate Buddha, grotesque in design and clumsy in execution, that are to be seen in Chinese temples. Are we seriously asked to believe that the sublime idea of uniting man to God, realized in the God-man, had such an origin?

We are constrained now and then to smile, as our Japanese friend proceeds to dilate on the influence that Christianity has undoubtedly exercised: "People allow themselves "to be duped by the deceitful promises Christianity holds "out in the future, in return for the heavy burdens it imposes "in the present. Thus the fear of death is scattered to the "winds by eternal life. Cupidity greedily devours the treach-"erous bait of treasures that neither rust nor moth can consume, "nor thieves steal. Fear is kept alive by unquenchable fire. "Fanaticism is conjured up by a vision of prophets. And it is "as difficult to tame a shrew or a wild horse as to restrain, the "fanatic who believes that his bliss will be increased an "hundredfold if he dies for Jesus." But is it not singular that the hope of a future reward should infuse courage into the martyrs? The entire hypothesis is, historically, a castle in the air. Again, it has been attempted to derive Christianity,

33. *Revue*, 1880, p. 391, seq. Kuenen, *Volksrel.* p. 231, where he also gives the literature on the opposite side both English (Bunsen) and German (Seydel).

particularly the doctrine of the Trinity and care for the dead, from Egypt. Historically speaking, this would seem to be nearer the mark. But what influence had Egypt on the Jews and Christians of Palestine? None whatever. Egypt influenced neither the Hebrew religion nor Greek philosophy.[34] And the proof of this assertion is not far to seek. For the Alexandrine Jews, though powerfully swayed by Greek philosophy, were unmoved by the Egyptian religion. The Jews in Palestine were subsequently carried down the same stream. They accepted the allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament; but the Egyptian religion remained for them a sealed book. This is quite intelligible from the position that Egyptian wisdom and the Egyptian religion then held. Herodotus, indeed, might think that Greek wisdom took its rise in the Nile valley, but Philo knew better—just the opposite was the case. Why should Jesus be the sole exception? Or shall we give credence to the fabulous story of Celsus that Jesus learnt magic in Egypt?

At first sight, it seems more plausible to maintain that Christianity is a blend of Jewish spirit and Greek philosophy. This is an old taunt.[35] Greek mythology had long been succeeded and symbolized by philosophy. Plato's profound conception of ideal truth and absolute goodness; Aristotle's realistic idea of the entire universe; the deep sense of need of redemption felt by Stoics and Platonists; the earnest spirit that shewed itself in mysteries and tragedies, —all seemed to bear a close resemblance to Christian mysteries and the Christian view of life. Clement of Alexandria says that Plato's philosophy was, in a manner, the Greek forerunner and representative of Christianity; and he calls Seneca a type of Christ.[36] Seneca, as already observed, by

34 Le Page Renouf, *Religion of Ancient Egypt*, London, 1880, p. 243-248. Pawlicki, *Der Ursprung des Christenthums*, Mainz, 1885, p. 52.

35 Orig. *c. Cels*, VII. 28 seq.

36 Fritz, p. 324 seq. Zoeckler, *Zeugen Gottes* I. 32. Lipsius, *Apocr.* II. I. 167 seq. Hoehne, *Das Neue im Christenthum gegenüber dem altclassischen Heidenthum*, Leipzig, 1887. Mattes, *Das Christliche in Plato*, *Theol. Quart.* 1845, p. 479 seq. Kuhn, *Einleitung*, p. 332. Weiss, I. 96 seq.

his merciless criticism of idolatry and superstition, and by his condemnation of the universal moral corruption, gave expression to the fundamentally Christian character of the soul. The moral principles he has enunciated, are so beautiful, that the ancients thought they had been borrowed from Christianity, and imagined a correspondence between Seneca and S. Paul. Origen, on finding in Plato and others many deep thoughts about God, forthwith interpreted the words: "God revealed it to them"* of an immediate revelation to the individual soul Neither will he deny that the Old Testament peeps through the Phœdrus, like heaven peeping through the mist of night.[37] But he sharply takes Celsus to task for counselling Christians to choose for their leaders the divinely inspired poets, wise men and philosophers, in preference to Christ. For these are guides blind to the truth, who lead men into the ditch of error. If they were not stone-blind, they had, at any rate, often strayed from the path of truth. What a contrast between the lives of the disciples of the philosophers, and those of the disciples of Jesus—the lives of unsophisticated men, women and slaves, whose only strength lay in Jesus! This much Origen said, not by way of disparaging the beautiful thoughts to which the Greeks had given utterance, or of slighting their sound teaching, but in order to show that the Prophets and Apostles had already taught these, and grander and sublimer truths besides.

Doubtless, the Socratic philosophy with its inestimable motto, "Know thyself," is a precious pearl. But unless we shut our eyes to the scepticism that succeeded and encompassed it on every side, we must needs confess that it is as a pearl in a foul oyster. So we must demur to the view that endows it with a continuous development, "attaining its zenith, yea its absolute "perfection in Christianity, and finding its expression in the words "of Jesus: 'What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole "'world' (i.e., know, see and clearly understand all things)

37 VI. 19; VII. 41. 49.
* Romans I. 19.

"'and suffer the loss of his soul' (i.e., know not how to be a "perfect man)."[38] This sample of rationalistic exegesis abundantly shows to what a procrustean treatment the preaching of Jesus must be subjected before it can be sealed with the stamp of Socratic philosophy. From "Know thyself," to "Do Penance," from the obstetrics of Socrates to the discourses of Jesus, in which he appeals to his Father in Heaven, and to his knowledge as Son of God, the way is too long, the chasm too wide to be bridged over by development. Lasaulx and others may call Socrates the heathen pioneer of Christianity; but Jesus did not borrow his doctrine even from a Jewish precursor, let alone a heathen. So nothing remains but the indisputable fact that Judaism and heathenism prepared the way for the Messias. Socrates, indeed, saw that it was the life, virtue and bliss of each individual soul which formed the purpose of society or state. By subordinating the end of the whole (state) to that of the indi-individual, he broke with ancient principles; but Jesus made the eternal salvation of the soul the end of existence. Socrates' farewell meal to his friends, and Jesus' last supper with his disciples, admirably illustrate the difference in their notions of this life and the next. The Greek sages were wanting in the divine power to make those happy who believed. True, they promised to lead them "to light amid the encircling gloom. "They tried to ferry the soul over the lake of metaphysics into "the land of truth and reality." But what did all that mean? What importance has it for the common man, who instinctively yearns for one who has power to break asunder the fetters of sin, and to whisper in his ear the saving word that is to reconcile him to God? How different is the ring in our Redeemer's words: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." This is the message of peace, the good tidings of the Gospel, which could not be gathered from

38 Fritz p. 274.

any philosophy, however great the common ground may be between revelation and philosophy.

The love of God and our neighbour, as we have seen, is the foundation of Christian morality. What place have they in Greek systems? A few stray passages have been raked out of Plato which seem to teach men to love their enemies. "The just man will do his enemy no harm."[39] How paltry such philosophic utterances appear, when set side by side with our Lord's practical preaching! Moreover, they are completely smothered beneath the state-idea, which crushed religion under its heel; beneath the contempt heaped upon the foreigner and the barbarian, the debtor and the poor; beneath the cruel treatment of slaves, the degradation of woman, the exposure of infants. Charity was unknown, and the love of neighbour had no real and solid foundation. The much-belauded humanity of the Stoics marks no advance on common distributive justice. Why were labour and labourers despised? Because brotherly love was wanting. The state alone commanded respect; man owed it not to his fellow-man. Hence cynical self-sufficiency and stoical self-deification reigned supreme. What a beautiful contrast is formed by S. Paul's declaration that God has no respect of persons! "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there "is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female. "For you are all in Christ Jesus."*

The Christian believes that "God is love." How different is this from the belief of the Greeks in their gods, or of philosophers, even the best, like Plato, in the absolute! How different, again, from the Eros of Hesiod, or the Love of Plato, which draws man towards the good! These are signs, indeed, that some faint traces of the divine image were still slumbering in the human heart, but they are without fire and life. "Those who have written beautiful things on the "supreme good, descend to the Piræus to pray to Diana as

39 Fritz, p. 291. Against, Mach, p. 144: Weiss, I. p. 158 seq.

* Galat. iii. 28.

"their goddess, and to be present at a solemn festival of "ignorant folk; and after they have discoursed nobly on the "soul and its happiness, and have lived well, they leave these "great themes which God has revealed to them,* to think of "what is base and trivial, and end by sacrificing a cock to "Æsculapius." "Besides others esteemed as gods, there are "many virgins who—whether guarded by men or not, we need "not enquire—seem to keep themselves chaste in honour of "the Godhead. But among Christians perfect chastity is "observed not for human honour, not for reward in money, "nor for fame's sake. And as they show that they have God "in their knowledge, God preserves them in an approved sense, "that, filled with justice and goodness, they may fulfil what is "becoming."[40] Finally, Origen reminds the Greek philosophers of an awful stain upon their religion and civilization—the vice of paederasthia (corruption of youth.) We have already allowed that Greek philosophy in some measure prepared the way for Christianity; but we most emphatically deny that the teaching of Christ was or could have been derived from it. Recently, however, it has become the fashion to state the case somewhat differently. The contention is not exactly that Christ and the Apostles were influenced by the heathen element; but rather that Christianity was Hellenized by the apologists of the second century.[41] Indeed, it was too bold to assert that Christ and his Apostles were open to Greek influence. Jesus never left Palestine, and never conversed with Greeks; for John XII. 20 can hardly form proof to the contrary. Origen ridiculed Celsus for such a taunt. What reasonable man could suppose that Jesus was conversant with the works of Plato! The same must be said of the Apostles, except John, who, during his later sojourn in Ephesus, must have come in contact with the

40 Orig. *c. Cels*, vi. 4; vii. 48. See Mach, p. 144 seq. Kuenen, *Volksrelig. und Welt-relig.* Berlin, 1883, p. 194. Weiss, I. 135.

41 Compare Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte* I. Freiburg, 1886. Kuenen, p. 191. Kuhn, *Einleit.* p. 322.

* Rom. I 19.

wisdom of the Greeks. But he did not let it influence his Christian teaching. For his doctrine of the Logos is not derived from Greek philosophy, nor even from the Jewish philosophy of Alexandria. The popular philosophy of the day may have induced John to expound it; but its main ideas are taken from the Sapiential Books of the Old Testament. In the following period this union of belief in the only-begotten Son of God, with the doctrine of the Logos, was a most important factor in the development of Christian theology, because it formed the chief attraction for Greeks who had received a philosophic training. The doctrine of the Logos became a link between Christian and heathen wisdom; but the notion of the Logos was not admitted into any ecclesiastical creed. But what about S. Paul? From his youth upwards he was familiar with Greek life and thought; he has quoted Greek poets at least thrice;[42] on his travels he had every opportunity of becoming acquainted with the wisdom of the Greeks. He became all things to all men, a Jew to the Jews, to the Greeks a Greek, in order to gain all to Christ. But S. Paul was expressly on his guard against importing Greek wisdom into the Gospel. He preached Jesus crucified, to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Gentiles folly. His wonderful success in preaching the Gospel came not by worldly wisdom, but by the manifestation of the power of God. The wise of this world God hath rejected.

The apologists made large use of Greek science. Many of them passed over from the philosophical schools to Christianity, and placed their secular culture at the disposal of the Church. At first, as we may easily understand, they could not always succeed in clothing the great truths of Christianity in the garb of Greek science, without somewhat shading the meaning. Their end and aim was to commend the faith, and induce the heathen to accept it. Naturally, therefore, they were led to give prominence to the points of contact between

42 Epimenides in Tit. i. 12; Aratus in Acts xvii. 28; Menander in I Cor. xv. 33.

heathenism and Christianity, to insist on the agreement between faith and reason, between Christianity and philosophy, to conceive faith as compensating the multitude for the want of science. Sometimes, the stress they lay on unity and agreement is so great, that differences are shut out of sight. It would almost seem as if Christian truth were denied to be an immediate revelation from God, and philosophy, or the truth of reason pushed up to the level of revealed truth. "Some germs of truth," says Justin, "are to be found in all philosophers. When we assert "that all things have been made and ordained by God, we "seem to be broaching an axiom of Plato; when we affirm "that the world is to be burnt, it seems an opinion of the "Stoics; when we are sure that souls continue to enjoy a "conscious existence after death, and that the wicked are "punished, while the good are happy and free from pun-"ishment, we seem to be expressing the conviction of "poets and philosophers; when we refuse adoration to "men, we find our teaching in harmony with that of the "comic poet Menander, &c."[43] For the Logos and the Son of God, Justin also finds analogies in Greek religion and philosophy. But he sufficiently indicates his line of argument. "If, then, we teach something similar to what "was taught by the poets and philosophers whom you "honour, but teach it more fully, and in a divine way, and "prove it, why are we unjustly hated above all men?" Concerning the chief mysteries the apologists were bound to be reticent, because of the imminent danger of abuse or denunciation. This was especially the case in the doctrine of redemption and in the mysteries of worship.

The bare fact that the early apologists forsook the teaching of heathen philosophy, to embrace Christianity, is itself sufficient to prove that they, neither consciously nor unconsciously, put Christianity on an equal footing with philosophy. Rather they became Christians, because they had sought truth and peace in the philosophical schools in vain.

43 *Apol.* I. 20. See Kuhn, l.c. p. 315. Weiss, I. 99.

What was more natural than to view this philosophy in the light of faith, to remove or to remedy its defects, and convert it into a weapon of defence, but not an object of faith? This condemnation of philosophy often sounds harsh, but it must be judged from the standpoint of faith; and then it proves how sharply the two provinces were marked off, one from the other. Tertullian, for example, "born and bred in heathenism, had "come to know its impotency; he had learnt how incapable it "was of giving peace to the soul, of calming the tempests of "passion, of providing a haven of shelter from the world's "dangers, and of inspiring hope beyond the grave."[44] Other apologists have had the same experience. Shall we, then, suppose that the maxims of philosophy would guide them in expounding their faith? No doubt their demonstrations are often philosophical; nor should we expect from them the deep supernatural grasp of Christian truths peculiar to S. Paul. Nevertheless, they have amply safeguarded the character of supernatural faith in the mysteries, whose saving power they had experienced in themselves and made known to others. From the moment of their conversion they were thorough Christians, and measured philosophic systems by the standard of Christian truth. Faith, not natural reason, was their principle of knowledge. Christian truth, having been immediately revealed by the Divine Word in person, they considered at once as the most complete and most certain of all knowledge. Heathen philosophy and religion, even when seen at their best, appeared to them only a very pale glimmer of truth. It was like the night lit up with a few rays of the Logos, as compared with the clear day that broke upon the world, when the Word was made Flesh. Into this globe of light they passed on their conversion. To this faithful and blessed light they abandoned themselves; in it they contemplated the world, and man, and his destiny, just as the eye of the body views all objects in the light of the sun. To be Christians is their glory and their happiness.

44 Hefele, *Theol. Quart.* 1838, p. 36.

"I have resolved," says Justin, "to cleave, not to men and the "doctrines of men, but to God and His teaching." "For "Christ commanded us to believe, not the doctrines of men, "but that which was foretold by the prophets, and taught by "Himself."[45]

On this point, again, we may appeal to Origen, the first biblical scholar among the Fathers. Celsus, he observes, brings forward a good deal from Plato, and puts it on a level with passages drawn from Holy Scripture,—a plan that may easily deceive even an intelligent reader. He contends that the Greeks said the same thing in a better way, and without threats or promises on the part either of God, or His Son. Origen replies first to the exception taken to the form, in which the sacred writers propose their doctrines. He urges, that the form was necessitated by the scope of the writings, which were intended for a wide circle of readers, while philosophy was never intended to influence more than a few. Again, the sayings of heathen philosophy, even when the same as the Christian, have not the same power to move souls to shape their lives accordingly.

Even now, continues Origen, the number of wise men, who have abandoned earthly wisdom, is small, as compared with the great multitude of church-going Christians; still, there are some who have exchanged the wisdom of earth for the wisdom of God.[46] So Origen knows of no real difference between the faith of his time, and the faith taught in Holy Scripture. Greek philosophy could neither originate nor transform the Christian religion. It was of great service, indeed, for giving a scientific mould and structure to the Christian religion; but the faith, though developed, remained ever the same and unchanged. If it were true that "Catholicity results from a fusion of "Christianity with antiquity," and that "Catholic doctrine,

45 Iustin, *Dialog. c. Tryph.* c. 80, 48. *Apol.* I. 46; II, 10, 13. Kuhn, l.c. p. 320 seq.

46 VI. 1, 14. See Iren. *Adv. Haer.*, I. 20, 2. Tertull., *De Praescr.* c. 7. Kuhn, p. 324. Bratke, *Die Stellung des Clem. Alex. zum antiken Mysterienwesen. Stud. und Krit.* 1887, p. 647.

"as developed since the third century from the teaching of "the Logos, is but Greek philosophy from a Christian stand-"point,"[47] the Christian religion would still be the groundwork, and Philosophy merely the mould or form in which it is cast; Christianity would still be the living force that assimilated whatever truth there was in heathenism, and utterly shattered heathen philosophy, when, in the guise of Neo-Platonism, it once more reared its head against it. Not the heathen philosophy in Christianity, but Christianity wielding the weapon of philosophy has subdued and destroyed the life and thought of the ancient world. In Christianity, there is, and must be, progress. Only, if a rigid conservatism and slavish adherence to the letter, rather than to the spirit and the power of life, were to dominate Christianity; or if truth were incapable of being widened and deepened, could progress and development be described as a deviation from primitive Christianity.

The Fathers ever took their stand on that word of S. Paul: God hath chosen the foolish, that He may confound the wise. Faith, one and the same faith for all alike, educated and uneducated, was the corner-stone of Christianity. "For," says S. Irenæus, "as there is but one faith, it is neither increased by "him who says a great deal about it, nor diminished by him "who can say but little." Even Clement of Alexandria, who set great store by philosophy as a preparation for the Gospel, looked upon mysteries outside Christianity as nugatory, unreal and inhuman. "The divine origin, the saving grace, the final "victory of this religion, with Christ as its author and centre, "are for him accomplished facts." Christianity was not changed by true, but by false *Gnosis*. And yet, so great and general was the conviction of Christians, that apostolic tradition was the only source of faith, that even the Gnostics, not daring to derive their doctrines from heathen philosophy, took refuge in a secret apostolic tradition. True Gnosis, as opposed to

47 Harnack. p. 253.

false, based Christianity on the teaching of Scripture and Tradition, the substance of which Irenæus and Tertullian triumphantly defended against the empty and vapid abstractions of the Gnostics. In this way Clement of Alexandria reconciled the Greek world with Christianity. "By blending "the two most powerful elements of Greek life, namely world-"wisdom and piety, he created a mould, in which the Christian "religion was to develop itself and gain strength;" but he accomplished this process entirely upon the basis of faith. "What is there in common between Athens and Jerusalem, "the Academy and the Church, heretics and Christians?" asks Tertullian. "Our institution springs from Solomon's hall of "pillars. And Solomon himself has declared that the Lord is "to be sought* in simplicity of heart. Let them beware, who "have brought to light a Christianity that is stoical, platonic "and dialectic."

Christianity, then, with its sublime doctrine and its severe morality, is not, and cannot be, the product of any human mind, be he a genius howsoever exalted above all other sons of men. Nor is Christianity merely the outcome of a development of Judaism, although its foundations are certainly laid in the Old Testament. No genius could have succeeded in divesting the deep religious sense of the Law and the Prophets of their earthly dress, unless the feat had been accomplished by a great and mighty deed, and under the very eyes of the people. How weak and vain to combine floating myths into a picture, that existed nowhere but in fancy; especially when we remember that Christianity took its rise in historic times, as the unchallenged Epistles of S. Paul testify! There was no time for myths to form, and overgrow tradition. The myths would have been formed long after Christianity had struck its roots deep into the ground. Why should the persecuted Christians have built up their hopes on cunningly devised fables? But if they were devised unconsciously, and without guile, they do not

* Wisdom I. 1.

explain the Gospel satisfactorily, even to a rationalist, as is generally admitted. Everything, says Origen,[48] had conspired against Christianity, so that it must have succumbed, had not the power of God upheld it, and enabled it, not merely to escape and rise again to the surface, but also to defeat all the powers leagued against it. And these Christians derived their strength from myths? Was the doctrine, that has overcome the world, nothing but the religious idea in general, electro-plated with myths about Christ?[49]

Greek culture, even in its highest stage, was unequal to producing such an ideal of religion and morality, or even to modifying it in essential particulars. From the very first, Christianity entered on the arena in opposition to Judaism and heathenism. Fully conscious of its absolute opposition to the views then prevalent, and to the rulers of the world, it claims to be the world-wide, universal, absolute religion. How, then, could it have been the fruit of the culture of the time? No; this religious power, unless it be the work of God, is inexplicable. It would be the greatest miracle in the world, and would remain as *the* miracle, even after miracles had been swept away. But even Christ, from whom it is called, and from whom the Apostles received their power and mission, is unintelligible, unless he was an exceptional and extraordinary ambassador of God.

We are far from denying historical development. In a later chapter in this treatise, we shall maintain that the finger of divine Providence is discernible in the history of the world and of revelation. But we cannot bring ourselves to think that we must seek, in the amalgamation of Judaism and heathenism, for that "which faith fondly considers as having appeared on the scene *tout à coup*."[50] Or shall we say that the "ideal man," Jesus, was the natural product of the deep religious faith

48 I. 3.

49 Strauss, *Versuch einer Religionsgeschichte*, p. 79.

50 Fritz, p. 345.

of the people of Palestine, combined with the martyr-like endurance of the Stoic (suicide?) But before Christ, such a result had never been achieved, either in Palestine, or in the Diaspora (Dispersion.) Christ is the only example; yet He came not in contact with Stoicism; and the force of martyrdom was next revealed in His disciples, poor fishermen from Galilee. Pounds of rationalist theories cannot outweigh these few ounces of historical facts. In this "age of Darwin," it is true, the distinction between species and species is swept away; but as certainly as the spirit differs from the body through which it works, so certainly does Christianity differ in kind from the other religions that preceded it. The Christ of S. John's Gospel would never have become the object of universal belief, if Stoicism had been "the vessel in which the transcendent "divinity of Judaism and Platonism had appeared in the "world, in the guise of immanent reason; in other words, if "it had been the means by which man became conscious that "the human and divine spirit were one, as expressed in the "saying of John, 'I and the Father are one.'" No philosophic system, but the belief that God has shewn grace and mercy in Christ, that He has redeemed the world and reconciled it with Himself, is the power in Christianity that has conquered the world.

Hence, the subject of our future enquiries will be Revelation as it is in itself, and as it was given through Jesus Christ; the person of Jesus, and his life. From what has already been said, it is clear that Christianity cannot be a "natural religion" in the sense of the evolutionist or rationalist, who, with Kant,[51] sees in the Sermon on the Mount merely the quintessence of natural morality. But we shall likewise show that Hegel's idealistic theory of evolution, according to which religion will develop for ever, far beyond the horizon of Christianity,[52] equally fails to do justice to Christianity.

51 Kant, *Religion innerhalb der Gränzen der natürl. Vernunft.*, ed. Hartenstein, vi. 255 See Denzinger, *Vier Bücher*, I. 323

52 See Kuhn, *Theol. Quart.* 1832, p. 43.

CHAPTER VIII.

REVELATION.

The entire history of the human race, and of the people of Israel in particular, is represented by the sacred writers of both Testaments, as the outcome of a special providence of God, the first outward manifestation of which appears in the immediate converse that God, the Creator of all things, held with our first parents in Paradise. Nor were God's dealings with man limited to his happy sojourn in Eden. Even after the fall God raised up, from time to time, a succession of men whom He specially chose, like the Patriarchs, Moses and Prophets, and to whom He made known His will. Lastly, in the fulness of time God sent His only begotten Son in the flesh,* who made known to his disciples all the mysteries of the Kingdom of God.† The things that had been hidden from eternity,‡ which no eye had seen nor ear heard,§ which the angels desired to behold, and about which the prophets had searchingly inquired,‖ were revealed to the Apostles by Him, who is in the bosom of the Father, and by the Spirit who searcheth all things, even the depths of the God-head.[1] From heaven, therefore, the Apostles received the

1 Col. i. 26; ii. 2. Rom. i. 17. I. Peter i. 20. Eph. i. 9; iii. 9. I. Cor. ii. 4-16. I. Tim. iii. 16. II. Tim. i. 9, 10. Tit. ii. 14. See Denzinger, *Vier Bücher*, etc., II. p. 77.

* Heb. i. 1.

† M. xiii. 2. Eph. iii. 4; vi. 19.

‡ Col. i. 26.

§ I. Cor. ii. 9, 10.

‖ I. Peter i. 10, 12.

truth; for they were taught by Christ and enlightened by the Holy Spirit; they were the dispensers of divine mysteries.* Not to the worldly wise were the things revealed, but to the humble and childlike.† Nor, again, was the preaching of these truths left to the fickle mind of man, but it was committed to the Apostles by the power of the holy Ghost.[2] To all, indeed, who believed and were baptized, was the Spirit of wisdom and revelation given,‡ but not in the same manner as to the Apostles. They were chosen to be preordained witnesses in the power of the Holy Ghost, to whose operations in them they could appeal.§ S. Paul also, though he had not known with Christ in the flesh, received an immediate revelation from the risen Saviour before the gates of Damascus. To him also was vouchsafed the same divine Spirit, revealing to him the mysteries of the Kingdom of God. From God, not from man, did he receive the Gospel which he spread and defended to his dying breath. So convinced was he of this, that not even an angel from heaven could make him accept another Gospel.[3] This, then, is what we call supernatural revelation.

The usual expression for revelation in the New Testament is ἀποκάλυψις (φανέρωσις occurs but once: I Cor. xii. 7; but φανεροῦσθαι often) a word wholly unknown to the Greeks, in this signification.[4] But it is used in the sense of "uncovering the body." This idea of unveiling has a special fitness when applied to the central dogma of revelation, the mystery of redemption, towards which the gaze of all believers had been turned since the fall. In this sense the phrase locks in its embraces everything appertaining to man's salvation. The revelation of this mystery, as of all mysteries, indirectly recalls

2 Luke xxiv. 48, 49. Acts i. 8. John xiv. 16, 17, 26; xv. 26, 27; xvi. 12, 13.

3 Gal. i. 1, 11 *et seq.* I. Cor. ii. 10 *seq.*; xiv. 2; vii. 10, 40. II. Cor xi. 17. Ephes. iii. 2-5.

4 Plutarch, *Cato maj.*, c. 20.

* I. Cor. iv. 1.

† M. xi. 25. J. xvii. 6 *seq.*

‡ Eph. i. 17. I. Cor., xiv. 6

§ Acts v. 3; xv. 28.

the hidden nature of the unapproachable God who dwells in light inaccessible.[5] The mind of man cannot, by its own strength, lift the veil that hides God's nature from sight, and shrouds the great problems of human existence. God Himself must draw near and whisper into man's ear the unerring answer. Sight is, indeed, the surest and most perfect instrument for gaining knowledge; but the human mind cannot see God and live.

A hidden God is replete with mystery for all men. Hence all religions have felt the need of slaking man's thirst with the waters of revelation. A divine revelation, given either in the dim past, or to founders and reformers of religion known to history, is the well whence Eastern religions have drawn their doctrines.[6] Doubtless, illusions on this head may be counted by the score. But underlying them is the great truth that God above, who is absolute truth, can instruct man in the things of God, and in the way of salvation, and heal the diseases from which the soul suffers. This is a truth which may be said to be engraven on the heart of man. And there is another noteworthy point. Who can fail to have been struck with the fact that the chief religions agree in their main features? that certain truths and customs, certain laws and ordinances everywhere repeat themselves? Is this the mere shot of accident, or the dart of chance? Of course that heritage of our common humanity, the religious disposition innate in the soul, conduces to this harmony; without it there would be but jarring strings, without hope of harmony. But has it produced worship, sacrifice and prayer? Worship and the motives inspiring it which are everywhere the same, are the offspring of revelation. And they in turn are a voucher for the correctness of the general belief in revelation. Belief in a divine revelation is the pillar of Greek and Roman oracles, and of the various priestly functions. Even

5 I. Tim. vi. 16. For the Old Testament passages see Denzinger, l.c. II. p. 87; also for the various theories on the notion of mystery.

6 Mach., *Nothwendigkeit der Offenbarung*, p. 327.

Fetichism and Shamanism have retained traces of a revelation, but they are so indistinct as to be almost past recognition.

If revelation were incompatible with man's inner consciousness, such an universal belief would be an impossibility. Its origin has been explained by two great factors in the life of man: man's unquenchable thirst for knowledge, and his ambition to subdue the world. To supplement his knowledge, it is said, oracles and prophecies were invented, while miracles or acts of divine power were requisitioned as an aid to his own feeble powers.[7] Even if this were so, the presence of "these two "elements of divine revelation" from the very beginning, would tell in favour of the common belief in revelation. What is so intimately bound up with man's existence must be founded on fact. Not only are the footprints of revelation traceable among all nations, but, what is still more remarkable, the traces grow in clearness and distinctness in proportion to the antiquity of the religion and cultus. Surely the reverse would be the case, if the pure inner self-consciousness had been the parent of this belief. Even philosophy, in its more advanced stages, has thought proper to look upon divine inspiration as the fount of its thoughts and conceptions. To the δαίμων which was said to make revelations to Socrates, the founder of the popular ethical religion, allusion has already been made. Socrates says that he, unlike other men, received revelations from the gods without asking for them. He glories in the art of divination, which he boasts is peculiarly his own. He defends his philosophic speculations by an appeal to the Delphic oracle, which had imposed on him the duty of teaching as the one task of his life. But when he stood on the threshold of the divinity, he was bidden to stay without, and not to penetrate within the shrine. Oracles and divination are the only means we have of knowing what the goodness of the gods has decreed to reveal to us.[8] Man should not seek to enquire into the nature and origin of things, into the movements of the heavens, or into other th ng

8 Apol. p. 40, A. Xenophon, *Memor* I.. 1, 6-9.

7 Pfleiderer, *Genetisch-speculative Religionsgeschichte*, 2 Ed. Berlin 1884 p. 399.

that appertain to physicists and physiologists.

From the foregoing a general definition of revelation may be easily gathered. To reveal is to manifest something hidden, to communicate something unknown. But, in a religious sense, revelation is the mediate or immediate communication of any truths that the human mind of itself can attain only with great difficulty, or not at all, whether they be in the main theoretical, practical or moral. And as the two kinds of truths are inseparably united, and as all religious truth must be regarded not in the abstract, but in reference to the whole life of man, divine revelation may be defined as the immediate communication of the truths that are necessary or useful to man in working out his salvation. Furthermore, to determine more precisely the nature of this communication, it may be said to consist in a supernatural effect produced immediately on the mind of man. It is a communication of thoughts, ideas, and truths made by one spirit to another, who is also able to think, and to drink in truth. It is a mysterious communing, a miraculous though withal intelligible action that the spirit of God works on the spirit of man.

A revelation, made immediately to the human mind, and containing truths that are beyond human comprehension, is usually called supernatural, in contradistinction to the natural revelation imbedded in the works of creation. For man can know the Creator from creation. This branch of the subject has already been discussed in the first volume. The natural knowledge of God, the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and the end of man fall within the province of natural revelation. It is verily a *revelation*, because it manifests God's being and power. As the artist is known by his work, so in a much greater degree, God is known by this beautiful creation which is the work of His hands. Moreover this revelation is *natural*, because nature is the object, and natural reason the subject. By their united action the natural knowledge of God is acquired. It may also be described as *mediate*, in contrast to

9 Jer Denzinger, II. p. 263 seq.

supernatural revelation which is immediate, and for which the mediate prepares the road. Natural revelation is the foundation on which supernatural revelation is built. It comprises all that God has spoken to man in His works. It is the necessary outfit of an intellectual and moral being. "We could not believe," says S. Augustine, "unless we had reasonable souls."[10] Unless there had been implanted in man at his birth a disposition and a craving to know God and to be united to Him, supernatural revelation would be a castle in the air. God's first motive in creation being His own honour and glory, natural revelation need not, perhaps, necessarily presuppose a being capable of knowing, though even this end and purpose must imply a being capable of knowing and appreciating the honour due to God. Creation without an intelligent being is like a body without an eye. As in revelation something is made known, it postulates some being to whom it is made known, and hence revelation is hardly separable from cognition.[11] All this holds in a higher measure of supernatural revelation. Should it be objected that a large expanse of revelation is an unknown region,[12] it must be borne in mind that this great unknown must be believed with a reasonable obedience. Were there no beings capable of knowing it, it would be blank and purposeless. Hence it is right to infer that the human soul is equipped for receiving that supernatural revelation which is designed to elevate the mind and heart, and to fit man for the highest action of which he is capable. An actual supernatural revelation presupposes the human mind to which God, having manifested Himself in creation, afterwards revealed Himself by a special communication. Have other worlds inhabitants to proclaim God's praises? This we have already shewn to be a necessary consequence.[13]

10 *Ep.* 120, 3 (*ad Consentium*). See Kuhn, *Einleitung*, p. 232. Staudenmaier, *Christliche Dogmatik*, Freiburg, 1884, I., p. 87.

11 Pohle, *Die Sternwelten u. ihre Bewohner.*, Köln, 1884–1885, II., p. 172. Pesch, *Die Welträthsel*, II., p. 242. Kuhn, l.c. p. 6, 292.

12 Scheeben, *Dogmatik*, II., p. 38.

13 I, p. 319.

Hence the Apostles, when preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, first instructed them in the truths that man has a conscience, and that the world is governed by a providence; and brought home to them the natural revelation that God has engraven on creation. Then, having thus prepared their minds, they taught that the same God had given a supernatural revelation which to man, groaning under the weight of his own sins and the sins of his race, was necessary for salvation, and offered to every one ready to believe an efficacious means of gaining heaven. The human soul instinctively craves to be enlightened, strengthened and comforted from above. Nowhere, but in God, who created it for Himself, can it find rest. This was the target at which all religions, philosophy included, consciously or unconsciously took aim. But the Platonic philosophy more than any other resounds with this shrill cry for the infinite and for absolute goodness, which is like a plaintive echo from lost Paradise.[14] Platonism, when revived in Christian times, caught up the echo, and thus made philosophy a rival of Christianity. Neo-Platonism made man's aspiration "for higher and nobler things the key-note of philosophy."[15]

Since the time of Stattler[16] it has been usual to view revelation under three aspects: possibility, actuality, and necessity. Following this order, we are now in a position to say that revelation is possible, as is shewn by the fact that the human mind is predisposed to receive a supernatural revelation, and that it can naturally know God. For, given this natural disposition of soul, the natural revelation of God, and the consequent knowledge of Him as a personal Spirit, both able and willing to manifest Himself, all objections against the possibility of revelation must vanish as mist before the sun. Receptivity on the part of man, and communicativeness on the part of God; the human heart needing and deserving help, and Almighty

14 Kuhn, l.c., p. 316.

15 Harnack, p. 666. Mach., p. 250.

16 See Werner, *Geschichte der Apol. Lit.*, v. 191.

God's loving condescension; the soul going astray in the darkness and looking eagerly for the light to break from heaven, and the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God;—such are some of the correlative conditions that render revelation possible. As ontologists fail to appreciate these conditions, they bring discredit on the ordinary proofs for the possibility of supernatural revelation. If the supernatural be regarded as a mere complement of the natural order, the connecting link is broken; but if we take our stand on the univeral causality of God, which is at work in both the natural and the supernatural order, and is directing both to the same end, the possibility of supernatural revelation becomes perfectly intelligible.

Rationalists, taking their cue from Locke,[17] deny the possibility of revelation on several grounds. First they urge that the infinite cannot hold intercourse with a finite being. But the argument on which they mainly rely, and into which they have thrown their whole strength, is that the mind of man cannot become the receptacle of truths that admittedly surpass human comprehension. In a barren dialectical discussion on the possibility of revelation, or if the question were, as rationalists fondly assume, a mere question of truth in general, and not of truth as a means of salvation, the objection would be plausible. For how could man by his own unaided powers attain to the idea of the supernatural? How could he reach a truth that lies beyond his ken? But this is to look askance at the problem, not to look it full in the face. The fact of revelation, which itself proves the possibility, must be taken as the starting-point. Then only is it incumbent on us to refute objections alleged against it, and to point out that it has natural foundations and points of contact with the mind of man. But for the reality of revelation, the question of its possibility would never have been raised. Supernatural revelation, as the word implies, is above nature; therefore the thought of it cannot arise, till it has been actually

17 Denzinger, II. p. 84.

brought before the mind. So we might fairly limit our task to showing that no valid reason can be alleged against the possibility of mysteries being revealed ;[18] but in view of the position taken up by rationalists, it is well to give some prominence to the positive proofs in its favour. Rationalism makes human consciousness the source of all revelation ; because, so it argues, "to speak of revelation "outside the mind of man is to try and get light from shade."[19] The more, then, rationalists extol man's natural powers, the more urgent becomes the apologist's duty of showing that the human mind, even in its own sphere, encounters insurmountable barriers. Man finds "mysteries" both in nature and in himself.*

Let us begin at the beginning, and follow the human mind in its progress, step by step. In order to arrive at the use of reason and full self-consciousness, it necessarily requires a stimulus and a help from without. This much must be granted by all who do not accept the unproven theory of evolution. Here we need not stop to define in what this stimulus precisely consists ; but the mere fact of its necessity shows that man is by nature amenable to external influences, and is dependent on them for the awakening of his self-consciousness. Thus, besides the dependency involved in creation, the finite spirit is seen to be dependent on others, in its intellectual and moral development. What occurred in the beginning of the human race, recurs all along the line. Even in natural knowledge, the human mind does not act or develop by its own unaided power. It is dependent on the impressions it receives from the outside world, on its perceptions, and on instruction. It is acted on by a thousand and one impressions, without the mental equilibrium being disturbed. It is swayed hither and thither by the association of the most paradoxical ideas, and yet its pulse

18 Granderath, *Zeitschrift fur Kath. Theol.* 1886, pp. 498, 601.

19 Fritz, I., p. 220.

* There is some force, no doubt, in this retort ; but the argument requires careful statement. The rationalist and evolutionist may reply that he grants the limitation of the mind in individual men, but not in the human mind at large. Though all things are not known, they are yet knowable. *Tr.*

beats normal and regular. Is, then, that divine influence, which we call revelation, alone to be scouted as impossible, and unworthy of man? All, who confess a Creator, will answer: No. Those who affirm, have abandoned the theistic standpoint, and are, therefore, not entitled to be heard in the question of revelation.

If the Creator made the human soul to His own image and likeness, it must, to some extent, have a capacity for participating in divine things. As the bodily eye, to be acted on by the sunlight, must be lightsome, so the eye of the soul must be able to perceive the rays of eternal truth. But the bodily eye differs from the spiritual in point of strength. When the sunlight is too powerful, the bodily eye is dazzled and blinded; but the eye of the soul becomes brighter and clearer, the more the light of knowledge shines on it. It can be penetrated and transfigured by divine light, and rendered fit to see truths lying in the direction indicated by reason, and not contradicting natural science, *i.e.*, truths which are above, but not contrary to reason. Hence revealed truth is not, as naturalists contend, impossible. Nor, again, does a truth by being revealed thereby become a truth of reason, as semi-rationalists love to imagine. On the contrary, the Increate Truth can impart its rays to its created image. And the created mind can receive the truth thus communicated, and lay hold on it more and more firmly, without ever fully comprehending it. Nay, however firmly such a truth be grasped, it is, and remains, a supernatural truth. Holy Scripture, which contrasts revelation with hidden mysteries, and speaks of a mystery revealed by Christ,[20] seems to contradict this view; but, in truth, it merely lays stress on the fact of revelation, without denying the mystery of revealed truth. Although made known, it still remains a mystery. The insight given into it, howsoever great it become, will never grow into perfect knowledge.[21] There is,

20 Rom. xi. 33-35; xvi. 25-27. Ephes. iii. 5. I. Peter, i. 12.

21 See Denzinger, II. p. 117, 139. Kuhn, *Theol. Quart.* 1845, p. 29.

indeed, a higher knowledge, but it is the knowledge of faith, which makes the mystery useful and precious to the spiritual life. If perfect knowledge be demanded, then, with the rationalist, we must either deny revelation altogether, or, like ancient and modern pantheists, raise the self-consciousness of man into the self-consciousness of God. Then, the noblest and finest fruits of the human mind in poetry and science are revelations of divine truth, of the divine ideal. Far be it from us to deny that something divine is therein revealed; but this revelation is just as certainly not supernatural. With Plato, we may say that the gods hold no direct intercourse with mortals, but only through the medium of love. Though this may be true of the religious life of the individual, it does not hold of the history of religion. On the contrary, this psychological fact itself would seem tc take for granted, that the revelation of the highest truths is possible. Nor is Aristotle indisposed to allow that truths unattainable by reason may be revealed.

The faith which aids reason to understand mysteries, though of an essentially higher kind, has its counterpart in the natural faith that wields so wide an influence in science and common life, in principles as well as in fact. In the child, faith goes before knowledge. Faith guards the cradle of the human race. Faith sways history. The principles of science are as much at its mercy as the life of the Church and the State. Even the principles of mathematics and philosophy lie at its feet. In the words of Pascal: "When reason has advanced to its "furthest point, it sees that there is still much which it can- "not grasp; and if it does not see this, its sight is very weak." On this question, Celsus is again to the fore. He taunts Christians with being led by a blind faith. And what is Origen's reply? That no objection can be taken to the Christian religion because it makes faith its starting point. It is, he says, the simplest, shortest and most general route; nay, it is so essentially the starting-point of all knowledge, that even to philosophy it is indispensable. Can the new rationalis-

tic and pantheistic philosophy walk without the crutch of faith? Can it prove that natural reason, or its thoughts are true? Thus from analogy we may argue that faith in mysteries, whether truths or facts, is possible; but the two differ in their ultimate principles. Natural faith rests either on the authority of universal reason, or of reliable and truthful men, while reserving the right of later proof. But in supernatural revelation, faith rests on the authority of God revealing Himself. Consequently, it is itself supernatural. For revelation not only means a communication of divine truths, but it also implies an elevation of man's understanding and will. Not as though man thus enlightened could prove all things by natural reason, but, with the transcending light of faith superadded, he is able to see clearly what was before hidden from sight; and his vision is unerring because the light is from God.

Natural reason, it goes without saying, is unequal to the task of showing that any particular truth of revelation, which is out of reason's reach, is necessary for man's last end, or is in perfect harmony with divine reason. Nay, it would seem to be moving in a vicious circle to prove revelation from supernatural faith and man's supernatural end, since revelation is the medium through which these have been made known. But when the soul, supernaturally enlightened, perceives that on these very points revelation meets the natural requirements of man, and thereby lays the foundation of his happiness, it is justified in assuming that the revelation of mysteries harmonizes with God's wisdom in creation. Thus a true and just estimate of creation goes to show that revelation is possible. This fact, together with the fact of primitive revelation, helps to explain the universal belief of mankind in a revelation. The idea of revelation, says Schleiermacher, denotes some original fact,[22] which serves as the keystone of a church or religious

[22] Schleiermacher, *Der Christliche Glaube*, I., 72. See Fritz, p. 32. On Leibnitz, Lessing and others, see Mach., p. 328. Pascal, *Pensées*, v. 1. On Origen, see Moehler, *Patrologie*, Regensburg, 1840, p. 509. On modern philosophy, see Schmid, *Wissenschaftliche Richtungen*. München, 1862, p. 87, and Denzinger, II., 90.

community, because although its own existence is historically unexplained, it determines the object in which the aspirations and pious exercises of individuals centre. But he thereby admits in principle an antecedent religious fact, however much he may generalize it, for all ancient history. So again, modern rationalists, while limiting revelation to nature and the human mind, to history and the material universe, still admit a revelation. Rationalists cannot form a correct estimate of the facts of religious history, or rightly diagnose the psychological conditions on which they are built, unless they rise to the complete concept of a living God. But a God who can neither reveal nor communicate himself, is not a God of religion, but a cold and lifeless abstraction. A man who cannot bring himself to believe in a God revealing Himself, has lost all true religious basis. "He," says Leibnitz, "who believes "nothing in things divine but what his reason measures, "has a very small idea of God." Even Lessing observes: "If revelation be possible and necessary, the fact of its "containing truths above reason, will be rather an argu"ment in its favour than an objection against it. A relig"ion from which all such elements are eliminated would "be no religion at all; for what is a revelation that reveals "nothing?"

What has been said of faith, holds good also of morality. The contention is set up that revelation robs morality of its autonomy.[23] Is man autonomous in any sense whatever? What does independent morality mean? Does it merely mean that man can derive the moral purpose of his action from his own nature, and that he is his own end? On the contrary, true morality consists in setting man free from the dominion of nature, and leading him to the goal of ideal holiness and justice. Christian truth, therefore, offers the best autonomy; for the truth, says our Lord, shall make you free.* Where has this been fulfilled except in Christianity? Divine revelation, working by the

23 See, for instance, Wundt, *Ethik*. Also *Theolog. Liter. Zeitung*, 1887, No. 11, col. 260.

* John viii. 32.

Holy Spirit, has made man master of himself, has set him free from sin and passion, from earthly aims and sensual desires. In the person of the God-man, it has set on high, before the gaze of men, the most sublime ideal of perfection. The lives of Christians may lag far behind this ideal; but, at any rate, it must be conceded that they who come nearest to the mark are the most moral of men. Have they thereby lost their moral autonomy? Is liberty in chains, because man is fettered in a silken thread of goodness and holiness? Thus the possibility of revelation shines forth far more gloriously in the moral than in the intellectual sphere.

But, it may be urged, is it beseeming the majesty of God to dole out revelation in broken bits? Does not such a revelation stultify itself? Would it not be more intelligible, if God had always remained in touch with the mind of man? This objection has been dealt with by the early apologists. To prove a continuous revelation they appealed not only to Old Testament history, but in John I. 4, 9, they detected a proof that the Logos had been uninterruptedly revealed unto all men. The spirit of God, says Origen,[24] dwelt in pure and holy souls, and brought divine truths to their minds far more effectively than Plato and all the wise men of the Greeks or Barbarians.

Semi-rationalists pounced on this thought with delight, and strained it to the utmost. That this general natural revelation rendered a special supernatural revelation superfluous, was an idea that never crossed the minds of Origen and the Fathers; rather, they supposed that supernatural revelation was thereby rendered more intelligible. Natural and supernatural revelation are two streams flowing from one common source—God's action in history and on individuals. The one elevates and transforms the other. One is ordinary, the other extraordinary. God's ordinary action, though not to be identified with the supernatural, is nevertheless admirably suited to form a link between knowledge purely human and that knowledge of

24 *C. Celsum*, I. 19. See Kuhn, *Theodor von Mops.*, p. 72.

faith which springs from supernatural revelation. The several acts of divine revelation, when viewed in this light, no longer, so to speak, bear the stamp of unintelligible caprice, but fit into one grand scheme of revelation which, resting on the two pillars of creation and redemption, gives effect to the eternal plan of salvation. Revelation finished with the redemption wrought by Christ; but redemption will not have done its work till the end of time, when God's dominion shall be complete.

The fact of the Incarnation is an evident proof that revelation is possible. "By the existence of Jesus on earth, God is "brought in such close contact as to converse with us, and "establish within us the blissful freedom of moral life. *Cum* "*Deo non potest agi nisi per verbum.*"[25] Such is the theory of revelation that finds favour in Ritschl's school, which eschews mysticism and metaphysics, and refuses to seek the God who converses with us either in the mental category of the absolute, or in revelation which teaches us about Him. Thus the possibility of revelation would be absolutely proved by the existence of Christ—the living and most perfect revelation of God,—were not his supernatural character and power also called in question. Again, to make a fact, devoid of external proof, the centre of religion, would be sheer mysticism. The union of the soul with Christ, and the union of the divine and human in Christ presuppose that God created man, and that man was created for God.

So far we have been endeavouring to prove that revelation is possible, by dwelling on the relations that exist between the natural and supernatural orders. Nor are arguments wanting from the history of revelation, as it actually exists. It may be shewn that God's revelation, though transcending nature, is laid on natural foundations. God's revelation to the prophets did not consist exclusively of things unknown to them. To

25 Hermann, *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott, im Anschluss an Luther dargestellt.* Stuttgart, 1886. *Theol. Liter. Ztg.*, 1887. No. 2.

make Himself understood, He spoke in figures that were daily passing before the eyes of the people. Thus when delivering His commands to Moses in Egypt, His language abounds in figures taken from Egyptian life. Even the sacred vessels and vestments were Egyptian in form. In Assyria and Chaldæa, the images were tinged with the hues of the Chaldean sky. In order to raise His hearers above the things of nature and of sense, to things supersensible and supernatural, Our Lord employed homely similitudes taken from nature and daily life. To the question put by the disciples on speaking in parables he replies: "Therefore I speak to them in parables "that seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand."* Here defective natural dispositions are assigned as a reason for withholding revealed truth. Hence the colouring of the sacred books, even in parts professing to be directly revealed, is borrowed from external surroundings. In form, all revelation is adapted to the capacity of human reason, and its contents strike a chord in the human heart. They who deny that religion entered the world in the guise of history, that is of revelation, "because religion would then be im-"possible,"[96] are beating and combating an idea of revelation that has no existence save in their own diseased fancy. No religion, and Christianity least of all, is wholly out of touch and joint with human nature. Religion develops those dispositions which are indispensable to man, if he is to receive faith, either natural or supernatural. Does a gift lose in value by being in correspondence with a need implanted by God in the human breast? Does Christianity, like a waxen image before the fire, lose all impression of being divinely revealed, because it alone gives a true solution of the enigmas of life, or because, its unique newness notwithstanding, it proclaims itself as the fulfilment of what has gone before, and condescends to man's infirmity? How would it be a fulfilment

96 Teichmüller, p. 82.
* Matt. xiii, 13.

if man could make it for himself? How are we to explain the vain efforts and gaspings of the ancient world? The greater the harmony, between the contents of revelation and the products of the human mind in its onward march, the less justifiable is the taunt that revelation is unreasonable and unworthy of man.

Can the philosophy of religion, which evolves all religions from man's inner conciousness, offer a better solution of the problem of religious life? Must it not perforce confess, that what is new in revealed religion finds a ready response in the innermost depths of the soul, and yet that reflection cannot be its one only cause, since it overleaps the bounds of mind and thought? It must confess, especially in the case of the great founders of religion, that here the Spirit of God has touched and quickened the spirit of man. Of course the pantheistic gloss put on this explanation deprives it of all real value, and, moreover, fails to account for the genius with which the founders of religion were endowed. Nevertheless we may still urge, and indeed with greater force, that there is consequently no course open but to confess that there is in the soul a mysterious depth, and that communication with it implies a "mystery," whose mists are not dispelled by placing it side by side with the so-called "mysteries" drawn from that philosophy of religion which is the darling of naturalists and pantheists.[27] Revelation, then, though it swell with mysteries is still possible, because it accords with man's dispositions and meets his wants.

God never acts without a reason or purpose. His actions outside Himself are subject to no kind of necessity. Nor are they the offspring of freak or caprice, but they are guided and ordered by infinite love and wisdom. Will the case be altered in supernatural revelation? No. As in the natural revelation the divine majesty was unveiled for God's honour and glory, which man, as the eye of creation, was bound to learn and to declare, so that same divine majesty has been supernaturally

27 Pfleiderer, *Religionsphilosophie*. See *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 1887, p. 308.

revealed to foster the inner life of the soul, and to promote the soul's salvation in God. The higher end which supernatural revelation proposes to itself renders revelation a necessity. It may be viewed under a twofold aspect, according as it bears on man's condition before, or after, sin. Before sin, naught but the supernatural union which God in His infinite love had pre-ordained for man, could make supernatural revelation necessary; for nature could not have burst its bonds. Therefore, to deny the necessity of supernatural revelation before sin, is tantamount to denying man's supernatural end.[28] Holy Scripture, indeed, does not say that God set before man a supernatural end, and established a positive religion in Paradise; but it speaks of God's personal intercourse with man, of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and of the tree of eternal life. This is enough to refer the establishment of religion to Paradise. No contract or documentary attestation was required. God himself set his seal thereto. Belief in God's authority was the beginning of religion; revolt against this authority was the beginning of sin.[29] Here, too, faith went before knowledge, and revelation preceded the development of reason. Without supernatural revelation man, who is by nature mortal, could not have divined, that he was destined to be eternally united in soul and body with God. For this reason the Fathers of the Church have ever sung the praises of faith, and called it the source of all knowledge. For a like reason they re-echoed that word of Plato which declares that man can learn truth from only two sources: God Himself, or those who are of God.[30] Now we see why all religions, however much they strive to meet present needs, still claim to strike their roots into the happy past, in which man stood nearer to the eternal and the absolute. Man wants a better guarantee for his religious

28 Hermes. See Kleutgen, *Theologie der Vorzeit*, II. p. 163.

29 See Denzinger, II. p. 426, 475.

30 See Chrysostom, *Hom. 63, 3 in Joann.* Storz, *Philosophie des heil. Augustinus*, p. 95. Kuhn, *Theol. Quart.*, 1841, p. 17. Also *Einleitung*, p. 343, 384. Denzinger, l.c. Petavius, *Proleg.*, I. 6

convictions than his own subjectiveness. He needs a divine authority.[31]

Of course, this universal persuasion as to the necessity of revelation only dates from the Fall, and was, indeed of corollary. But, in his present state, man cannot attain even his natural end. If the individual conscience buries this truth in silence, the history of mankind proclaims it from the housetop. The consciousness of sin and of moral helplessness is the clearest indication that supernatural revelation is needful. Heathen religion proved lamentably incompetent to satisfy the cravings of the nobler and better natures. Philosophy could not step into the breach. On the contrary, by destroying belief in the gods, it had opened wide the gate for doubt and scepticism. A moral life was, indeed, admitted to be a necessity, but how distorted moral notions had become, and again, how inadequate was the means to hand! All attempts to improve man's relations with God, or to shake off the deepfelt guilt of sin by means of idolatrous worship were predoomed to failure. Philosophy itself was yearning for a teacher of truth and a redeemer from sin. It sketched an ideal, but was powerless to galvanize it into life. The sense of sin, the longing for redemption, and the cry for help from the sky above gained in volume and strength as civilization advanced.

Plato makes Socrates say that unless a God, through the mediation of λόγος τις θεῖος,[32] point out the beginning and the type of true righteousness, no improvement in the world's condition is possible. Socrates thinks it the best policy to wait calmly till there come one to teach man how to comport himself towards God. Aristotle says that human reason stands in the same relation to the knowledge of divine things, as the eye of the owl to clear daylight. In his view, the wise are as little versed in divine things as the ignorant. If any one thinketh himself to be wiser than others, he is arrogant. Says

31 Muehler, *Schriften*, I. 350.

32 *Rep.*, II., p. 361-362. *Apol.*, p. 117-118. *Phaed.*, p. 85. See Mach, p. 252.

Anaxandrides: "in divine things we are all fools and know "nothing." "Which of the Gods," exclaims Horace, shall the "people invoke to aid the sinking empire? To whom shall "Jupiter commit the task of expiating our sin? O prophetic "Apollo, we beseech thee, do thou at length come."[33] "The "feeling of estrangement from God, the longing for a higher "revelation was universal in the last ages of the ancient world. "This yearning only expresses the consciousness that the "civilization of a classical people was on the decline, and the "presentiment that a new order of things was at hand."[34]

The expectation of a holy one, a redeemer, a god, told in another way on religion. The Sibylline prophecies of the birth of a divine child; Virgil's 4th eclogue concerning a Saviour; the report mentioned by Cicero that a Saviour-king would come and reign supreme; Suetonius' testimony to the existence of a widespread notion that one should come from the East,—what else do these desires and hopes, these rumours and legends prove, but that the old world deeply felt the need of a new revelation, and ardently longed for redemption? All heathendom vaguely remembered the promise of a better age, in which a wise hero-king of heavenly descent was to appear and restore the early state of bliss and innocence. Revelation is the only sure anchor. It alone can give man security from error and passion, as he is tossed hither and thither on the stormy sea of life.[35]

Rationalists, Deists, Naturalists and Pelagians, misjudge and overestimate man's power, when they assert that reason can acquire all necessary religious knowledge, and that the will, weakened by sin, is possessed of sufficient strength to do good. The number of those who, in such circumstances, could come within a reasonable distance of religious knowledge, or, do natural moral actions, would be but small; and even their path would be beset with great difficulties. And, in such

33 *Ode* I., 2.

34 Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, 2 ed., III., pp. 56, 368. Mach, p. 231.

35 Mach, p. 327. Denzinger, II., p. 60.

cases, how truth and virtue are poisoned with error and sin! The Catholic apologist has no reason to depreciate[36] man's natural powers, but he may not ignore the wholesale corruption of heathen life. Religion is for all classes; but a religious society requires an objective standard, a higher authority.[37] It may be granted that, among the heathen, the common people were often better than their rulers and the cultured classes; still pagan religions must be set down as unworthy of man. Religious life among the heathen was utterly effete. A comparison between their faith and morality and that of the Jews reveals a difference too great and wide to be accounted for on any conceivable hypothesis, except that a revelation had been given in the Old Testament. In the present order, the powers of the human soul and will are undeniably crippled and wounded. Man is enslaved to selfishness and sensuality. And yet he writhes under their galling yoke! The work of widening and deepening man's natural powers, and of perfecting and elevating them in such a way as to enable man to gain heaven, can be accomplished only, by an absolute intellect and an all-powerful will. No progress in science or culture can span the chasm, without revelation as the bridge.

Against modern rationalism and naturalism the Vatican council issued a dogmatic definition on the possibility and necessity of divine revelation. On the *possibility* it defines as follows:* "If any one shall say, that it is impossible or "useless for man to be taught by revelation concerning God "and the worship to be paid to Him, let him be anathema." Again:† "If anyone shall say, that man cannot be raised by "God to a higher than natural knowledge and perfection, "but that he can and ought of himself by continuous progress,

36 Moehler, *Symbolik*, 6 ed., p. 81. Weiss, I., 91.

37 Drey, I., 158. Werner, no. 182. Less reliable, Denzinger II., pp. 67, 45:

* "Si quis dixerit, fieri non posse, aut non expedire, ut per revelationem divinam hom: de Deo, cultuque ei exhibendo edoceatur, anathema sit. cap. II. can. 2.

† Si quis dixerit, hominem ad cognitionem et perfectionem, quae naturalem superet, divinitus evehi non posse, sed ex se ipso ad omnis tandem veri et boni possessionem jugi profectu pertingere posse et debere, a. s. ib. can. 3.

"to arrive at the possession of all truth and all goodness, let him "be anathema." Regarding the *necessity* of revelation the council teaches:* "It is indeed owing to this divine revelation that, "in the present condition of mankind, also those things con- "cerning God, which are of themselves not inaccessible to "human reason, can be known by all with facility, firm assurance "and without admixture of error. Nevertheless, it is not for "this reason that revelation is to be called absolutely necessary, "but, rather, because God in His infinite goodness has ordained "man to a supernatural end, that is, to a participation of divine "blessings that utterly exceed the compass of the human mind; "for 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered "'into the heart of man, what God hath prepared for them that "'love Him."† In these words the Vatican council sanctions the distinction between a relative and an absolute necessity of revelation. For revelation, besides being an epitome of the truths of reason, and giving breadth and depth to mental knowledge, pre-emininently contains truths that transcend reason; truths, that reason could not lay hold of without the aid of revelation, and which, even after being revealed, can become the object of faith unto salvation, when reason has been strengthened by grace.[39]

Thus the primary aim and purpose of revelation is to teach man what appertains to religion, that is, in other words, faith and morals. Natural knowledge lies within its sphere only in so far as it is an indispensable condition and means of attaining religious knowledge. At first sight a perusal of the Mosaic history of Creation, of the Psalms and Sapien-

39 See Kuhn, *Theol. Quartal.*, 1860, p. 328. Denzinger, II. p. 243.

* Huic divinae revelationi tribuendum quidem est, ut ea, quae in rebus divinis humanae rationi per se impervia non sunt, in praesenti quoque generis humani conditione ab omnibus expedite, firma certitudine et nullo admixto errore cognosci possint. Non hac tamen de causa revelatio absolute necessaria dicenda est, sed quia Deus ex infinita bonitate sua ordinavit hominem ad finem supernaturalem, ad participanda scilicet bona divina, quae humanae mentis intelligentiam omnino superant; si quidem oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit, quae praeparavit Deus eis, qui diligunt illum.

† I Cor. ii. 9.

tial Books, seems to suggest that revelation has a wider scope. But in reality it is not so. For the hinge on which the history of creation turns is the relation that things visible bear to man and to God; the Sabbath rest is unmistakably the purpose that shines forth in the week. Again, the Psalms and the Sapiential Books, taking the history of creation for granted, expound the practical wisdom of life.

Religion is not concerned solely with metaphysical truths. Rather it is moral truth and the commandments that invest them with significance. In ancient times no sharp distinction was drawn between theoretical and practical truth. Even in Paradise a divine prohibition was given. Then, afterwards, God made a covenant with Noe and Abraham, and gave commandments through Moses. When the people transgressed the Law, and were unfaithful to Jahve, the prophets threatened divine vengeance. Jesus himself declared it to be his duty to do the will of Him that sent him. He required his disciples to be perfect, as their heavenly Father is perfect. By representing himself as the way, the truth and the life, he set before the eyes of the disciples a living model, and realized that ideal after which ancient philosophers and poets had longed. Henceforward perfection of life was to consist in imitating Christ. "If thou wilt be perfect," said Jesus to the rich young man, "go, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, "and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow "me." *

Revelation, to attain its end, must likewise give man the power to do its bidding. No one, who allows that God can exert influence on man, or who sees the effect that merely human example, teaching and education produce on the heart, will deny that revelation can posses such a power. If the forces of nature work by mutual attraction and repulsion, why should Creator and creature be kept asunder in the spiritual life? We call the creations of genius in poetry and

* Matt. xix. 21

in art divine inspirations, because they soar far above the dull atmosphere of this work-a-day world. Are virtue and heroism less precious, less divine? In respect of these we are using figurative language; divine grace produces deeper and more excellent effects. Now if the soul proceeds from God, the God who made it must be able to purify and refine it when defiled, to strengthen its weakness, to light its paths, and guide it back when it has gone astray. In the Old Testament, perhaps, the workings of divine grace, except in a few instances, do not stand prominently forward. The "just" of the Old Law were not all saints, but they are immeasurably superior to heathen "saints." Their faith and fidelity, their trust and hope in God in the midst of trials and difficulties, demanded more than natural power. To firm hope in the promised redeemer was joined the power of faith and virtue. And their faith was reckoned unto justification.

The Law was given by Moses, grace and truth by Jesus Christ. And who shall count or describe the fruits of grace? Contrasted even with the Old Testament, it is a new garment with which the disciples were clothed, a new wine that cannot be put into old bottles. Lo! all things are new! St. Paul vividly illustrates the difference between the state of the Gentile Christians before and after conversion by the figure of the old and the new man. Even now the difference holds good.

Not theory, but fact must decide the way in which revelation was given. If it has pleased the wise and good God to reveal[40] himself and his eternal counsels to man in a supernatural way, the mode of revelation must be gleaned from what actually took place. At the head of revelation stands the history of Creation, —that primary natural revelation which is the foundation of all supernatural revelation. Now God's creative action has never ceased, for He preserves creatures, and guides them with a providence altogether special, on account of the freedom of man. Hence revelation itself becomes, as it were, part

40 Concil. Vat., *Sess.* III. cap. II.

and parcel of the continuous act of Creation. God still promotes the end of creation even by extraordinary interferences. He equips man with perfect means for attaining the end marked out for him, which is now supernatural. Hence the two cannot contradict each other; nor can revelation destroy the created nature in which its action is exercised. In the present order of things, revelation happens to take the form of a restoration of creation. And the reason is not far to seek: for man, the crown of Creation, is fallen from the supernatural state in which he was originally placed.

From this review of the relations subsisting between revelation and creation, it follows that revelation is adapted both to the nature of the individual who is the recipient and organ of revelation, and to the spirit of human society, which, in the course of generations, is to guide man to his ultimate end. Both are bound by the same general laws of development Hence, as we naturally infer, revelation varies according to circumstances of time, place and person. It can never dispense wholly with external media; it proceeds from things external and visible to things internal and invisible; it guides man inwardly and outwardly, and conforms to his capacity. Both in particular and in general, it assumes the character of a divine *pædagogia* that aims at lifting the human race to a higher level. "Revelation is to the human race what education "is to the individual. Education is revelation to the individual, and revelation has been and still is education to "the race."[41] To attune their spirit the prophets lived in the wilderness or near the roaring water, or invoked the aid of music, or were trained in the schools of the prophets.[42] The people were bidden to prepare themselves for the promulgation of the law; and the nations had undergone a gradual course of preparation at the hands of divine providence that they might be fit to receive and understand revelation when it should be vouchsafed to them.

41 Lessing, *Uber die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes*, I. p. 421.
42 Denzinger, II. p. 168.

The human mind possesses at least a passive receptivity for revelation. Now, in its outward form, revelation adapts itself to the capacity of the mind that receives it. At times it is moulded on certain peculiar ideas current among certain peoples (e.g. Cherubim in Ezechiel);[43] or, again, it borrows its forms and imagery from the immediate surroundings of each prophet. The outward form is most striking in certain religious practices, forms of worship, and models and types in the Old Testament,—all which either image supernatural truths, or forecast some future revelation. Internal revelation may also be effected by means of figures, since future events may be figuratively or enigmatically foreshadowed in dream or in vision. This is the case, in a remarkable degree, in the Apocalypse, and in prophecy strictly so-called.

All ancient peoples believed dreams to partake of a divine character. Uncivilized races still so regard them. The Greeks often went to sleep in their temples, and thought their dreams aglow with divine inspiration. In the Old Testament, and even in the early part of the Gospels, God manifested his will in dreams. What is more admirably adapted to the workings of the Spirit of God on man, than that state of sleep in which the spirit withdraws from the outer world, and is left undisturbed in its contemplations.[44] Still a dream is often no more than an idle delusion. Not every dream is to be regarded as a message from God. A dream must be tested.

Ecstasy or ecstatic vision is akin to the dreamy state. The term vision, as used in Theology, commonly denotes the medium through which revelation is conveyed to the prophets (seer), as distinct from the words in which it is imparted to others. This distinction, though not to be taken exclusively, is of prophetic and apostolic origin. Orientals, be it observed, were passionately fond of symbolizing internal events. When the prophets say: Thus saith the Lord, we may not straightway conclude to a

43 Denzinger, II., pp. 234, 257. Vigouroux, IV., pp. 322, 360.

44 Theodorus Mops. See Kihn, p. 106. Denzinger, II., pp. 254, 231. I. Cor. xiv. 14.

vision. A vision of the divine Being, in the strict sense, was very rare, if indeed it ever occurred. For neither the vision of Moses, nor that of S. Paul in which he was rapt to the third heaven, need be so understood. How far the prophet, as distinct from the believer, rightly understood the vision, depends on the character and object of the vision. In the visions that have been handed down in writing, we have no means of judging their internal aspect. We see merely the outward form. Still we may rightly infer that the prohets could not have recounted them unless they had some intelligent grasp of their contents. For they were given for a definite moral purpose.

In no sense can ecstasy be set down as absent-mindedness. The prophets and all organs of revelation in the Old Testament have been styled by Philo, Josephus, the Apologists, and many Fathers, as "divine organs,"[45] employed by the spirit of God to articulate divine truths, just in the same way as the musician makes sweet music with harp or psaltery. But even they took a one-sided view of prophetic vision, and occasionally used phrases borrowed from heathen divinations. They looked mainly to the form of revelation, and believed that the prophets, when they received revelation, were necessarily in a state not of ecstasy, but only of absolute receptivity.[46] But when the Montanists pushed this idea to fierce extremes, and required for inspiration an ecstasy that involved loss of consciousness, the Fathers entered an emphatic protest. The work of the Spirit, they say, is the higher illumination of the prophets; and it lies, not in the removal or destruction, but in the elevation of their natural powers to a level above nature. In this lies the precise distinction between prophetic ecstasy and heathen divination. In the latter the diviner was seized by a "divine frenzy" which showed itself in distortions and convulsions; in the former the activity of the spirit was intensified by the partial or total inter-

45 Denzinger, II., pp. 169, 179. Diestel, *Altes Testament*, p. 18. Möhler, *Patrologie*, pp. 226, 281. Schell, p. 283. *Vindiciae Jahnii*, p. 195.

46 Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 397. Fritz, p. 236. Denzinger, II., p. 211. See S. Thomas *s. c. gent.*, I., 6; *Summa Theol.* II. II. Q. 171, a. 1, contra.

ruption of sense-action. The false prophets "raved."*[47] Hence the early exuberant statements of the Fathers are to be explained by their later and more sober statements, and not *vice-versa*. Thus, though "instruments of God," the prophets were withal intelligent instruments.

Both in dreams and in visions it is necessary to know that a divine revelation is taking place, but no exact knowledge of its contents is required. Hence S. Thomas distinguishes between the separate *species* and the *lumen propheticum intellectuale* to which the *donum propheticum* refers. In both cases the perceptive power of the mind is increased, both in the judgment which receives an accession of *lumen intellectuale*, and in the *acceptatio seu repræsentatio* which is accomplished by the *species*. But just as he who has the habit of faith does not of necessity know explicitly every thing to be believed, so he who has the habit of prophecy need not know everything that appertains to prophecy.[48] Here again, however, the form must be distinguished from the contents. With reference to the latter we may certainly say with Suarez, it is sometimes evident, and sometimes not. S. Thomas also allows *quædam obscuritas et remotio*.

The highest mode of revelation, and that which alone begets security, comes by word of mouth.† All other kinds are subordinate to it, and do but serve to make the revealed word more clear. These other kinds to be recognized and correctly estimated, must be seen in the light of the immediate revelation which comes by thought and word.[49] The thought combined with imagery leaves one half of the mind lit

47 S. Hieronymus, *in Ephes.* III. 5; *in Nahum Praef.* (Opp. vii., 589, iv., 535). See also Schell, p. 285. Denzinger, II. p. 229: Kihn, pp. 105, 152. Kleutgen, l.c., I., pp. 60, 71.

48 *Summa Theol.* II: II. Q. 173, a. 2, if. a. 7, *Quaest. disput. de proph.*, a. l. ad. 4. See Denzinger, II. p. 232. Kihn, pp. 108, 156. Schell, *Das Wirken des dreieinigen Gottes*. Mainz, 1885. p. 282.

49 Denzinger, II. p. 268.

* Jeremias xxix. 26. Osee ix. 7 Sophonias III. 4.

† Ps. xlviii. 5; Isaias liii. 1; Romans x. 16.

up and the other half in darkness. Jahve often spoke to Moses, and the prophets heard God's voice. Jahve promised Moses to raise up a prophet like him, to speak His word, and to say to them all that was commanded.* Jahve ordered the prophet to be put to death who should presume to say in His name what He had not commanded. Hence S. Peter says: "The holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost."† Hence the prophets and apostles were enabled to speak wisdom among the perfect, yet not the wisdom of this world, but the wisdom of God in a mystery, which is hidden, which God ordained before the world for our glory.‡ Here the saying of S. Augustine is most appropriate: *Vetus testamentum in novo patet, novum in veteri latet.* For the New Testament is preeminently a revelation by the word, the *Logos.*

In recent times Ontologists have made common cause with Rationalists in calling in question these two kinds of outward and inward revelation; saying that *intellectual* revelations, i.e. divine illuminations of the intellect, are the sole factor in inspiration. But, divine illumination, howsoever necessary it may be to the founders and reformers of religion, is utterly inadequate to account for the actual introduction and preservation of a religion that drags every item of human life into its net. And least of all, could it account for the religion of Christianity. Unless we are prepared to admit that the central object of Christian worship was manifested in history (Incarnation) the appearance of Christianity on the world's stage is unaccountable. If a union between the infinite and the finite has been actually accomplished; if God's revelation is our salvation‖

* Deut. xviii. 18.

† II. Pet. i. 21.

‡ I. Cor. ii. 6.

‖ The meaning of this sentence is that Christ, the God-Man is God's revelation and our salvation in the concrete. It was necessary for the argument to retain the abstract terms used by the auther according to the manner of Scripture, e.g. Luke ii. 30. John iv. 22. *Tr.*

coming forth from the inmost depths of the divinity; if it is the birth of the eternal in the bosom of time; if it is the dawn of the eternal day of heaven on earth—then, indeed, is Christianity a divine institution. The deep thoughts of the prophets cannot have sprung like those of poets from their natural genius; nor were their revelations the outcome of the moral grandeur of their character. Still less can such a theory be applied to Christ; it is ludicrously inadequate. How happened it that the prophets were thus impressed with the idea of the moral government of the world? How could they know themselves to be so swayed by it as to conceive it as something outside themselves? What emboldened them to speak and act in Jahve's name? All these points must be cleared up first. For in the Greek Philosophical Schools a similar transformation was not effected till two centuries and a half later, and yet these fell far below the prophets. The prophets had, indeed, a very high moral sense and the most exalted idea of God, but still they appealed to a divine revelation strictly so-called, and preached it to the stiff-necked Jews at the peril of their lives. Who will say, with such a phenomenon staring him in the face, that they were deluded with regard to the kind of divine inspiration? And how about Christ? How often and how persistently he appeals to his mission from the Father, his vision of the Father, his relation of sonship to the Father! It would be doing violence to all Scripture to explain what it clearly introduces as revelation, merely as the divine influence in general, and not as a special divine communication.

CHAPTER IX.

REASON AND REVELATION.

Revelation is not wholly above reason, nor, again, is everything above reason a revelation. For then reason would have no means of probing the origin and nature of revelation, or of discriminating a true revelation from the false. But the purpose for which revelation is given, imperatively demands that both the immediate recipient and those to whom it is afterwards imparted, should be able to recognize it with certainty as coming from God. Reason, furthermore, must be in a position to draw a clear distinction between revelation and all other inspirations. For at times, the human mind, wandering among the odoriferous flowers of fancy, or giving play to invention, calls into being creations that seem and, in a sense, are divine. Then, again, the mind is acted on by influences which, though superhuman, are not divine. The angel of darkness can clothe himself with a vesture of light. How is one to be distinguished from the other? How shall man distinguish the revelation that comes from God, from superhuman impulses and the creations of fancy? No man has penetrated far enough into the inner shrine of his inmost self to be able to discern the nature of his thoughts, or to trace them to their source.

And yet such proof is absolutely necessary, because the gravest issues are at stake. The attitude that man adopts towards revelation is big with consequences. It is a question in whose deep bosom lie buried eternal life and eternal death. On its right solution depends whether eternal weal or eternal

woe shall be man's lot. Revelation has exerted a magic influence on the whole history of mankind. By revelation Judaism prepared the way for Christ, and for eighteen centuries Christianity has scattered the blessings of revelation over the face of the earth. Who could be so indifferent, or so senseless as to scorn or to despise this most wonderful phenomenon in the history of mankind?

"Try the spirits if they be of God,"* says St. John. And in these words a command is laid alike on the immediate organ and on the believer, not to accept revelations without proof. Moses, indeed, was God's ambassador. But what about the Egyptian priests and sorcerers? Are there not false Christs and false prophets? Heathen religions, like the Old Testament, exacted belief. Judaism still disputes with Christianity the rightful ownership of the Scriptures. Sects and factions cut themselves adrift from the ship of Peter, and yet each asserts that his own little cock-boat is the depositary of revelation pure and undefiled. As shadow follows light, so error treads in the footsteps of truth, and superstition dogs the heels of faith. Satan often appears as an angel of light. It is not always easy to distinguish the shadow from the substance, the kernel from the shell. Fanaticism and enthusiasm always have a suspicious resemblance to genuine zeal for the good, true and beautiful. If, then, there be a divine revelation, there must also be certain, infallible tests and signs for recognizing it as such. God's revelation must bear God's stamp, so that man, acting as a free, reasonable being, may, by its means, work out his salvation.[2]

As no one can believe in God, unless he can know God by the natural light of his reason, so belief in revealed truth is impossible without some ground for belief.[3] It is not the

1 Eccl. ix. 3. Acts xiv. 11. II. Peter, 1. 19.

2 Orig., *c. Cels.* III. 14. Aug., *de util cred.*, c. xvi.

3 S. Thom., II. II. Q. I. a. 4 ad 2.

* I. John vi. 1.

supernatural truth, but the truthfulness of the revealer that has to be established; though, of course, this gives indirectly an external guarantee for the truth itself. If once the supreme fact be solidly established that a revelation has been made, the rest will easily follow. Facts, it is clear, are not proved like truths of reason, nor, again, will the evidence for natural facts avail for supernatural facts, nor will the same line of demonstration hold for both; but it is sufficient to show that the fact in question cannot be due to natural or preternatural causes. Not that the fact of revelation is to be established merely by reason and experience, or that Christianity should be reduced to a truth of reason. This would be a complete surrender to the rationalist position. Rather our duty is two-fold: to present the external and internal evidence for supernatural facts and revealed truths in such a light, that the intelligent eye of man may securely grasp it; and to show that revelation, far from being unreasonable, is more in accord with the dictates of reason than its negation. Thus, by destroying prejudice, and by dressing revelation in colours that are pleasing to reason, the way is paved for faith.

In the first place the organs of revelation, as the immediate recipients are called, must be able to read visions aright, and to recognize the voice they hear as clearly the voice of God, whether it be uttered within the soul, or in some outward sign, as in the Theophanies. But how is God's voice to be recognized? How can it be distinguished from the mellifluous voice of reason, and the pipings of fancy? A man, with a religious bent, naturally inclines to hold converse with God, and such a one is firmly persuaded that God draws near to him. In such cases the danger of hallucination is proportionately great. Not, of course, that all religiously-minded men are at all times deceived. This would be an absurd and monstrous proposition. And yet, on the other hand, every one will maintain that these are exactly the class of men to whom revelations, as a rule, are given. Revelation, indeed, is not dependent on its

organs, but it is both self-evident and historically certain, that the organs employed by God, are, for the most part, suitable. The patriarchs, Moses and the prophets were not all heroes, but they were men with a deep religious sense, overflowing with zeal and enthusiasm for God's honour. Balaam is the exception that proves the rule. When, therefore, they declare that they distinctly heard the voice of God resounding within the caverns of their soul, is it unfair to suppose that they were the dupes of their own religious enthusiasm?

But, on the other hand, may it not be argued that their very religious character, and the deep reverence in which they held God's word, must have saved them from the pitfall of self-delusion? They were well acquainted with their own religious disposition, and its ordinary manifestations. When, therefore, by warnings, threats, and chastisements, they solemnly declare, in the face of all the people, that God had spoken to them such and such words, their personal conviction that God had revealed Himself to them in an extraordinary manner must have been strengthened by proofs as clear as the noon-day. What emboldened them to take up the heavy and thankless task of executing God's judgments? Jeremias stood aghast at the commission God had laid upon him. "Ah! Ah! Ah! Lord God," he says, "behold I cannot speak, for I am as a child." And "the Lord said to him "Say not I am as a child: for thou shalt "go to all that I shall send thee; and whatsoever I shall "command thee, thou shalt speak. Be not afraid at their "presence, for I am with thee to deliver thee, saith the Lord."* Jonas received the commission to announce God's judgment to the Ninivites. "And Jonas rose up to flee into Tharsis from "the face of the Lord."† Amos glories in having been led away from his flocks by the spirit of God to Bethel, the scene of his activity, where in the face of the priests he rebuked the King and people for their sins. Could they have been mistaken?

* Jeremias I. 6.

† Jonas, I. 3.

Could they have been so far duped by fanatical self-deception? The supposition is preposterous, and has a strange and weird look, when put forward by men who credit the prophets with a purer monotheism, and deeper moral convictions than those which obtained in the earlier stages of religious development. To say that the prophets spoke symbolically, or that they adopted a categorical manner of speech, by way of accommodating themselves to their hearers, would, even after making due allowance for the Oriental habit of depicting purely internal phenomena as external events, stretch principles till they were close upon snapping. On the contrary, it would be impossible to acquit them of conscious and intentional deceit, if they set up their own ideas and wishes as the word and will of God. But the prophets go even a step further. They represent themselves as writing down their revelations in obedience to God's command. Unless, then, we are prepared to cast doubt on their sincerity, we cannot gainsay their convictions. Hence when the prophets, in clear, firm tones, deliberately proclaimed aloud to the people the mission with which God had entrusted them; when they declared themselves to have been moved thereto by the Spirit of God; when, in fine, their account opens with the assuring words: Thus saith the Lord:—even rationalists like Reuss and Pfleiderer allow that they were neither inflated with bombast nor cajoled by delusions. Their message, they concede, was not the outcome of their own personal reflection, but that they felt themselves impelled to deliver it by a superior power which would brook no contradiction.

What kind of certainty, it will next be asked, had the organs of revelation? The answer to this question will largely depend on general theories of the genesis of faith and natural cognition. If we hold that some immediate knowledge, or some evident truth underlies all cognition, we must, after the manner of many apologists, allow that the fact of God having spoken was brought home to the organs of revelation by some kind of natural evidence. But, of course, the evidence is of a moral kind, that is,

it rests on the fact that the organs of revelation are moral religious-minded men.[4] There are some theologians, like Lugo, who even go so far as to hold that the divine origin of revelation is unsupported by metaphysical or moral evidence; it rests, they say, on nothing more than a moral certainty, which, however, does not take its rise in a purely natural psychological cause, but reason grasps *per modum unius* both the revelation itself and the indubitable marks of its divine origin. And yet, for all that, the moral certitude might still be human; but then it would not have imparted to the recipient the energy necessary for communicating the divine revelation, for speaking with divine authority, and for demanding obedience to God's word. A man, filled with reverence for God, and not a fanatic, would not dare to put forward such a claim, unless, when in the act of forming a judgment on the origin of the revelation, he had been enlightened and influenced by the spirit of God.[5] Such judgment is thus rendered supernatural. Therefore, in a word, as regards the historical fact of revelation, none but the immediate recipient can have physical evidence, whereas others must rest content with that moral certitude which springs from historical faith.

And now another factor enters into the calculation. The organs of revelation were not left without the means of setting an outward seal on their inward convictions. Their very vocation to the prophetic or apostolic office was a pledge of inward enlightment, and the supernatural power with which God endowed Moses, Elias, Eliseus and other prophets must have been to them an overwhelming proof of the truth of the revelation. This is abundantly clear in the case of the apostles. The God-man to whose discourses they had listened, and whose miracles they had witnessed, gave them their commission. By visible tokens they were filled with the Holy Ghost and con-

4 See A. Schmid, *Wissenschaftliche Richtungen*, p. 98. Kuhn, *Einleit.* p. 12:

5 Denzinger, II. 245 with S. Thomas. For the various theories on the point, see Schmid, l.c. p. 270.

secrated in their calling. It was an external apparition also that converted S. Paul, and made him a vessel of election to preach Christ to the heathen. He and the other apostles enforced their preaching, by shewing forth the spirit and power. This combination of inward moral strength with the power to work wonders in the physical and spiritual world could not be a source of deception. Here we may fully exclaim with the man born blind; "From the beginning of the world it hath not been "heard, that any man hath opened the eyes of one born blind. "Now we know that God doth not hear sinners."*

Although miracles may have been wrought in the name of Jesus by men who were not his disciples; still, even so, the purpose of the miracles was to promote God's honour, and the spiritual improvement of man. But the false prophets had other aims. If their deceit succeeded for a time, it could not last for ever, as the history of Elias and the prophets of Baal pointedly proves. Against the accusation that he has a devil, our Lord defends himself in these words: "I have not a devil, "but I honour my Father, and you have dishonoured me. But "I seek not my own glory: there is one that seeketh and "judgeth."† "If I glorify myself, my glory is nothing. It is "my Father that glorifieth me."‡ "I receive not glory from men."§ When Jewish exorcists at Ephesus tried to drive out evil spirits in the name of Jesus whom Paul preached, the evil spirit answered them: "Jesus I know, and Paul I know: but who are you?"‖ Compared with the prophets of the most High God, who were stoned and sawed asunder for truth and righteousness,** Antisthenes, Crates and Diogenes, with all their earnestness and self-denial, seem but pigmies.[6] Consider, says

6 Orig., c. *Cels.*, vii. 9.

* John ix. 32. 31.

† John viii. 49.

‡ Ibid. 54

§ Act. xix. 13.

‖ Ibid. v. 41.

** Hebrews xi. 37.

Origen, the life of a Moses, a Jeremias, an Isaias, a Daniel, and others. While reputing the heathen oracles as nothing, we are full of admiration for the prophets of Judea, because they led earnest lives, worthy of that Holy Spirit who has nothing in common with the fortune-telling of demons.

The more intensely the prophets were convinced of their divine mission, the easier was the task of convincing others. The same means that produced conviction in them, must also have served to beget faith in their preaching. The more unpleasant the task, the greater the opposition of the false prophets who pandered to the vices of the people, the more efficacious the means they needed. To Moses, as we have already said, God gave the power of working miracles, as a proof to the Jews and to Pharaoh of his mission. The prophets also worked miracles; these and the fearless uncompromising attitude they assumed, and their contempt of death must have been a sure sign to their hearers that the hand of God was with them The opposition they encountered was born not of doubt in their mission, but of dread of the chastisements they declared to be hanging over the peoples' heads. Miracles are such an obvious test of revelation, that all heathen religions and even heretics[7] have appealed to them. Power over the material universe is proof of dominion over nature, and is second only to the power of creation. Works of grace considered in the abstract, are, indeed, of a higher order; but man, in the concrete, being a creature of sense, is more deeply impressed by proofs taken from objects that strike the senses. For these make him more sure of his position and inspire greater confidence.

Jesus himself followed precisely the same method. The Son of God having taken upon himself human nature, in order to converse with men, and to be their visible teacher, and having thus obscured his divinity under the veil of his humanity, was bound to act in an human fashion and to give some outward sign of his divine teaching. As, in the Incarnation he humbled

7 Tertull., *de Praescript*, c. 44.

himself by putting himself on a level with sinful man, so in his teaching he condescended to man's infirmity, and worked miracles in order to raise man by means of things of sense to things supersensible and divine. When the Jews did not believe, he pointed to his works as a voucher for his words: Though you will "not believe me, believe the works."[8] He referred the delegates, sent by the Baptist, to his works. At the grave of Lazarus he prayed to his father, not because he doubted of being heard, but for the sake of the people about him, "that they may believe that thou hast sent me."* From the superhuman works of Jesus, Nicodemus concluded that he was a teacher from God.† Many of the people believed in him, because they saw the things that he did.‡ The Jews were in admiration at his new doctrine, because with power he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey him.§ St. John sums up Jesus' doing among the Jews in the words: "And whereas he had done so many miracles before them, they believed not in him."‖ Miracles also furnished the disciples with a motive of faith.** Jesus wrought many miracles before their eyes to awaken and strengthen their faith.†† The faith of the disciples was not fully confirmed till they were perfectly convinced of the resurrection of Jesus.‡‡ So much importance did Jesus attach to miracles, in the work of faith and redemption, that he said in his parting discourse: "If I had not done among them the works that "no other man hath done, they would not have sin; but now "they have both seen and hated both me and my Father."‖‖

8 John viii. 28; x. 37, 38; xv. 24.
9 See Denzinger, II., 163 seq.
* Ibid. xi. 4.
† Ibid. iii. 2.
‡ Ibid. xi. 45.
§ Mark i., 27.
‖ John xii., 37.
** Ibid ii., 11.
†† Ibid xx., 30.
‡‡ Ibid xx., 28.
‖‖ Ibid xv., 24.

This verse is particularly instructive when taken in conjunction with verse 22: "If I had not come, and spoken to them, they "would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for their "sin."

Even as to the form of proof, Jesus accommodated himself to his hearers,—creatures of senses as they were. When Jesus promised forgiveness of sin to the paralytic, the scribes took offence, because God alone can forgive sins. And Jesus said to them: "Why think you these things in your hearts? "What is easier to say to the sick of the palsy: Thy sins are "forgiven thee! or to say: Arise, take up thy bed, and walk? "But that you may know that the Son of Man hath power on "earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy), I say "to thee, arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house. And "immediately he arose; and taking up his bed, went his way "in the sight of all, so that all wondered and glorified God "saying: we never saw the like."* Assuredly he refused the Pharisees a sign from heaven, not because he thought proof by miracles of little worth, but because he felt bound to check their idle curiosity and frivolity. From the passage† (though critically suspect) on the signs of heaven and of the times, his purpose is made clear. The insane assertion that he was casting out devils by Beelzebub, brings out in strong relief the malevolence of the Pharisees. Such would not have believed, nay did not believe, if one had risen from the dead."‡ S. Paul also recognizes the necessity of proof, when he thus defends his own action. "For I have no way come "short of them that are above measure apostles; although I "be nothing. Yet the signs of my apostleship have been "wrought on you, in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and "mighty deeds. For what is there that you have had less than "the other churches, but that I myself was not burdensome to "you.§

* Mark ii., 8.
† Matth. xvi., 2., 3.
‡ Luke xvi. 31.
§ II. Cor. xii. II. See Galat. iii., 5.

This attitude taken up by the Jews, however, shows clearly that miracles, as a test, are not wholly independent of the will of those who hear and see them. A miracle, besides being a sign that strikes the senses, is also a supernatural fact. If, as a sign, it appeals to the reason and will of the witness, as a supernatural fact, it appeals to faith. But faith is a work of divine grace and of free will. No man comes to Jesus unless the Father draw him. The conviction that these facts are really miraculous, comes from a free assent and a personal act. For this reason these apologetic proofs would seem to be merely *rationes persuasoriæ*, and not demonstrations.[10] Hence we seem to be moving in a circle, though not a vicious one, because the ultimate reason of this knowledge, as of all faith, is a work of grace, and consequently incomprehensible. With faith begins man's birth to a new life divine; he is born again of God. But, after all, the circular motion is only apparent. As regards miracles especially, the two cases are wide apart. With later theologians we may distinguish a *fides humana* and a *fides divina*. In the order of nature, though not always in point of time, supernatural faith must be preceded by an apologetic demonstration of revelation. For most of the faithful this demonstration is accomplished in an implicit or unconscious manner; but, in the case of those who embrace the faith late in life (e.g. Fathers of the Church) it is effected by a conscious process. "Without these miracles neither Jesus nor the Apos-"tles would have obtained credence, nor would Chris-"tianity have been founded and propagated.[11] Once a "certain way of looking at divine things has gained a foot-"ing in a people, or in a multitude of people, its hold on "them is so powerful, that any essential change for the "better (e.g. the transition from falsehood to truth) is "next to impossible, without external intervention from "above. If Christ had not worked miracles, if signs had "not accompanied the activity of the apostles, the divine

10 Kuhn, *Theol. Quart.*, 1860, pp 293, 313. On the other side, Schmid, l.c., p. 251.
11 Orig., *c. Cels.*, I., pp. 46, 52.

"power of doing in like manner would not have been "transmitted to their disciples, nor would the gospel have "ever subdued the empires of Greece and Rome. Error "had encroached on the rights of truth, and man, who is "compelled by nature to regard the worship of the society "in which he is placed as the faithful expression of relig- "ious truth, needed external proofs of an extraordinary "kind for the new order of things, until it had struck deep "root into the life of society."[12]

In truth, blessed are they who have not seen and yet believe. Faith begotten of the word of Jesus is of a higher order than faith that comes by miracles.* But we must take man as nature and education have made him. True and perfect faith in the Messias was not a product of human reflection and external testimony, but a work of grace and revelation.† Still grace worked for faith on the lines that education had laid down. Even the Apostles climbed to the summit of faith only by degrees. To argue from miracles to a higher power and to the veracity of the miracle-worker, is quite as correct as to argue from the visible world to the invisible Creator. And the demonstration is still more cogent, because it starts from an extraordinary supernatural fact.[13] "As man arrives at reason by some "knowledge of God through nature, so by certain super- "natural facts, called miracles, he is led to a supernatural "knowledge of the Being in whom he is to believe."[14]

On the whole the Israelites had no doubt about the genuineness of the signs that were given to them.‡ They followed false prophets, not because they really believed in them, but because their conscience was evil, and their heart rotten to the

12 Moehler, *Symbol.* 6 ed., p. 343. See *c. gent.*, I. 9.

13 S Thom. in III. *sent dist.*, 24, a. 2, ad 4. *QQ. disp. de fide*, a. 10; *c. gent.* I. 6, 9; II. II. Q. II. a. 9. See Schmid, p. 250. Denzinger, I. 139; II. 319, 487.

14 S. Thom., II. II., Q. clxxviii. a. 1.

* John iv. 39.

† Matth. xvi. 17.

‡ Deut. iv. 32.

core. Their ears were tickled by the flattering speeches of the false prophets, and they opened their hearts to these rather than to the earnest warning words spoken by the prophets of God. Although Moses clearly proved himself to be the ambassador of heaven, Pharaoh's pride made him turn a deaf ear to God's commands. As Holy Scripture says: God had hardened Pharaoh's heart. The cause to which the prophets attribute the disobedience of the people was also, the Evangelists tell us, at the root of Jewish obstinacy in refusing to believe in Jesus. Did we not know that man's wickedness has sunk deeper down than ever plummet sounded, we might be inclined to doubt whether the miracles were as great as the records represent, or, at least, whether they have that importance as criteria of revelation which we ascribe to them. But daily experience teaches that the hard knocks of fortune, and the shock of extraordinary phenomena may either arouse man's inmost sensibilities, or have the contrary effect of making him callous and hardened. What wonder, then, if the working of miracles was beset with like difficulties?

Idols and idolatrous priests were utterly powerless to work miracles, and Holy Scripture regards this as an overwhelming proof of the falsehood of idolatry. Miracles are the boundary-line that divides Gentile from Jew, and now in turn the Jew from the Christian. They form the abyss over which heretics cannot pass over to Catholics. So they have ever been the distinguishing mark between the true coin and the counterfeit, between the good and the bad. By a miracle Abel was proved to be more pleasing to God than Cain; by miracles Moses discomfited Pharaoh's magicians, and Elias routed the prophets of Baal; by his miracles Jesus stopped the mouths of the Pharisees, and Paul confounded Bar-Jesu, smiting him with blindness. Miracles divided the exorcists from the apostles; they form a rampart of Christianity which the unbelieving host cannot storm. So, in the last days, they will mark off Antichrist from Henoch and Elias.[15] The fact that the heathen also appeal to miracles

15 Pascal xxvii, 8.

compels us closely to scrutinize a miracle; but the appeal, in itself, tells in favour of miracles as a test. Buddha forbade his disciples to work miracles, and Mohammed disclaimed the power. But in Buddhism and Islam, development swept away in its onward rush the barriers erected by their founders. A religion addressed merely to cold icy reason, would never spread beyond the North Pole. Religions that endure are popular; and no popular religion is unfed by miracles.[16] All religion is by its very nature intended for the people. Not so, however, theology, which nevertheless is built on faith. When Islam was in the heyday of youth faith supplied the place of miracles, for the simple reason that Mohammed never professed to found a new religion. His only aim was to amalgamate existing religions. Being unable to work miracles, he had no talisman but his personality: "Light," it is true, "shines brightest when enveloped by darkness, and the "stars do not shine at all until the sun has withdrawn "from the firmament."[17] But surely miracles were not a mere rushlight, that the prophet should despise them. Mohammed's lack of power put him on his defence; and he felt constrained to set over against it his conversation with the angel Gabriel, and his journey to heaven.

Miracles, like all external proofs, are not absolutely necessary, except at the beginning. But they are then especially necessary, if the new revelation, really or apparently, sets itself up in opposition to ideas of long standing, and lays the axe to forms of worship that have taken deep root. This was not the case with the revelations of the Old Testament. For God was always the object of faith and adoration, and each succeeding revelation seemed to develop and to follow naturally on the preceding. The Israelites, being the chosen people, knew that their God was near to them, and that He revealed Himself to His prophets. But with the heathen it was not so; and at the time of Christ, the circumstances of the Jews underwent a change. The heathen

16 Teichmüller, p 109.
17 *Revue de l'hist.*, 1880, II., p. 268.

had lost all true knowledge of God, and the Jews, though believers according to the letter, had not perceived the drift and spirit of the revelation of which they were the storehouse. The scribes, having lost the open sesame to understanding the Old Testament, were unable to unlock its meaning for others. And thus the revelation of Christ, the Messias whom they had long desired, came upon them as something new and incomprehensible. The Jews sought signs, and the heathens wisdom, but the signs were as insufficient for the Jews, as wisdom had been for the heathen. Hence for both Jew and Gentile, the union of these two criteria, the external signs and the internal wisdom, was necessary if the seed of faith was to spring up in their hearts. In this lay the force of the appeal to prophecy.

Naturally, the test of prophecy was not available for the first revelation, and in the Old Testament it is applicable only within certain well-defined limits, that is, when the prophets, besides pointing to the future Messias, also foretold the chastisements that were hanging over the heads of the Jewish people. Prophecies relating to earthly matters, when fulfilled, besides serving as a guarantee for the fulfilment of other prophecies, also strengthened the people's faith in the entire revelation that God had made through the prophets.[18] When Jesus said to His disciples: "And now I have told you before "it come to pass, that when it shall come to pass you may "believe,"* he made the fulfilment of prophecy a motive for faith in revelation. If this is true of the prophecies made by Christ, how much more true of the prophecies that culminated in Christ. Christ was the target at which all prophecy was aimed. In Christ all that the prophets had foretold was to find fulfilment. All the scattered rays of prophetic light were, so to speak, to converge in one focus, Christ. Hence, to justify his claim to be the Messias, Jesus appealed to Moses and the prophets; he bade the disciples of John tell their master the Messianic

18 See *Theodor von. Mops.*, apud Kihn. p 29

* John xiv. 29.

works he had done; belief in Moses he recommended to the Jews as their panacea; to the rich glutton he declared that the teaching of Moses and the prophets was enough; to his disciples he expounded the Scriptures beginning with Moses.[19]

As the argument from prophecy could not be used with full force till after his death and resurrection, Jesus, during his mortal life, chose to confirm his teaching by miracles rather than by prophecy. But after is resurrection his appeals to prophecy grew in frequency. The Apostles, also, were well skilled in invoking the test of prophecy. Thus the Evangelists and S. Paul appeal to the Old Testament, not only for the several acts of the Messias, but also for his manifestation, in its entirety. Thus prophecy became a sort of voucher for the truth of the facts themselves, or, at any rate, a test of their supernatural character. "For," says Justin, "what to men seemed incredible and impossible, God foretold "by His Spirit, in order that, when it came to pass, it might "be believed, because it had been foretold."[20]

What was more likely to astonish heathen proselytes, acquainted with the Old Testament and Jewish aspirations, than the fulfilment of prophecies foretold upwards of a thousand years? Besides confirming their belief in the person and revelation of Christ, and the teaching of the apostles, it gave fresh strength to their belief in the Old Testament revelation. Next to a miracle, an exact forecast of the future, is most calculated to excite surprise and admiration. For, as God alone can know the future and disclose it surely and unerringly to man, it is no wonder, as the apologists tell us, that the marvellous fulfilment of prophecies uttered long ago should have made a deeper impression on the heathen than any other proof advanced in favour of Christianity. "The "fulfilment of prophecy is the most reliable and the best "possible proof of Christianity."[21] So great was the store

19 Luke xxiv. 25. John v. 39, 45. Math. xi. 5.

20 *Apol.*, I. 33.

21 L.c. pp. 31, 33. See Moehler, *Patrolog.*, p. 284. Kleutgen, *Theol. III.* p. 358 Diestel, *Alt. Test.*, p. 49. Denzinger, II. p. 357.

set by the prophecies that they came to be almost identified with the whole of that revelation which is fulfilled in the New Testament; for the Old Testament was only regarded in so far as it was mirrored forth in the New. And all that took place in the New, happened in order "that "the word of the prophet might be fulfilled." The Jews themselves were compelled, against their will, to bear witness to its fulfilment; for their unbelief was likewise foretold. Their hostility to Jesus is itself an unequivocal testimony to the existence of prophecy.[82]

Yet another element, one might almost say a more ideal element, in revelation, helped to make revelation credible, and deserves to rank as a test. The external criteria, as we have said, suppose the internal. The contents of revelation must be such as to stamp them in man's eyes as heavenly wisdom. We have already dwelt on the distinction between the truths of revelation, and the truths taught by heathen religions and philosophers.[83] So convinced were the Jews that their revelation was unequalled and unsurpassed, that they heaved a sigh of pity or pointed the finger of scorn at the foolishness and moral aberrations of the idolaters around them. And in truth, the religions of their neighbours, the animal-worship of Egypt, and the lascivious star-worship of the Semites could not but set the contrast in bold relief. The sublime doctrines of creation and the fall, and of God's providence guiding His people, joined with the splendour of their worship, might well make the Jews look upon their religion as the pearl of religions, and the envy of mankind. The law itself, simple as it reads when set in the Decalogue, was a perfect mosaic, briefly setting forth all that God had written in the heart of man, such as none but a hand guided by God could have pencilled.

All this holds in a tenfold degree of the doctrines of Jesus.

82 Pascal 15, 1; 10, 9 seq.

83 See also Kleutgen, III. p. 395.

The language is so simple, the similitudes so homely; and yet how deep and unfathomable are they in mystery! How pure, how sublime the morality inculcated! How gentle and how winning the example of Jesus! Where, in this wide world, were doctrines so admirable to be found? Where the power that subdues all things? Such harmony in life and teaching, in word and example, could not but be clear and convincing proof that the doctrines preached by Jesus and the Apostles came from God. Truth and power were written in lines of light on his brow. The simple, yet crushing force with which he replied to questions asked with a view to ensnaring him in his speech, silenced his adversaries, and put them to shame. Pharisees, official guardians of the law; Sadducees, representatives of a wealthy, but time-serving nobility and priesthood; scribes, skilled in the subtleties of literal exegesis, and trained to disputations;—one and all were put to flight by the simplicity, truth, and natural eloquence of Jesus. "And no "man was able to answer him a word; neither durst any man "from that day forth ask him any more questions."* No man of good-will could listen, without feeling that such teaching was of God, not of man. Those who put his teaching in practice, felt that they had drunk from the well of live-giving truth. "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words "of eternal life: and we know that Thou art the Holy One of "God," answered S. Peter, in a critical hour. Miracles, as we have just seen, were a criterion for the disciples. But, as we learn from the words of Our Lord's parting discourse, their faith was also influenced by higher motives. The Apostles, being deeply moved, and almost stupefied by the prophetic breath of their Master's words, exclaim: "Now we know that "thou knowest all things, and that thou needest not that any "man should ask thee. By this we believe that thou comest "forth from God."† These words extorted respect from

* Matth. xxii. 46.
† Ibid. xvi. 30.

Fichte. John, he says, is the only fit company for a philosopher. For he alone respects the rights of reason, and gives the only proof philosophy can admit: "Every one who doeth the "will of him that sent me will perceive that this teaching is of "God."[24]

Who then can describe the impression produced by Christian truth on the minds and hearts of the heathen who listened to the Apostles? Paul, indeed, says that he preached not in wisdom, lest the cross of Christ should be made void. For the word of the cross to them indeed that perish, is foolishness; but to them that are saved it is the power of God. Again, reviewing the little community at Corinth, he finds there not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble. But he also urges that God has made the wisdom of the world foolish; that unto them that are called, this folly and stumbling-block are the power and wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than man: and the weakness of God is more mighty than man's strength. This clearly shows us the method and course which the Apostle pursued. He knew he had but to open the mind and heart of his hearers in order to convince Jews and Gentiles, that their former wisdom was foolish, and their former faith useless and frivolous; and forthwith, enlightened by the Spirit of God, they felt within them the truth and wisdom of the apostolic preaching. The Apostle did not put his trust in human wisdom, but in the shewing of the Spirit and power. But he spoke wisdom among the perfect, yet not the wisdom of this world, but the wisdom of God in a mystery, a hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory, and which no eye hath seen. But to us God hath revealed it by His Spirit. For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God.* Jesus promised all who believed

24 *Anweisung zum selig. Leben*, p. 155. See Denzinger, I., pp. 208, 296.
* I. Cor. ii.

that the truth should make them free.* And the truth freed Jews and heathens from the yoke of the law, from the weight of its ordinances, from the bondage of sin and passion, of death and the devil. Truth has not only burst asunder the bonds that made the greater part of society live a life unworthy of man, but it has also set free and quickened the reason, the the will and the heart. And lo! all things were new!

To the taunt that Christianity had only blind faith and no wisdom, the apologists replied by setting forth the effect of Christian teaching on mind and heart. If S. Paul had known nothing of wisdom, would he have dared to make such promises? Or, did he, perchance, fail to redeem his promises? The man who puts forward this plea, Origen thinks, may profitably read the Epistles, and study the meaning of the several statements, e.g., in the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Philippians and Romans, to say nothing of the beautiful gospel narratives.[25] Let him shew that he has understood S. Paul's words, and found some foolish and worthless. Attentive reading will certainly make him admire the genius of a man, who could express great truths in common words. Or, if he does not go the length of admiration, he will make himself ridiculous, either by trying to caricature the apostle's meaning, or to call in question his statements. No man, in ancient or modern times, was more competent to form a judgment than Origen. He was the first to attempt to give a complete proof for the truth and divinity of Christianity. As he was the first systematic teacher of dogma, so he was also the first systematic apologist.

The ancients, as we have already noted, drew no hard and fast line between theory and practice, but they viewed truth and wisdom in their applicability to practical life. Now Christianity, if viewed in this light, will be seen to special advantage. For it

25 *C. Cels.*. III. p. 20. Moehler, *Patrol.*, p. 528. S. Chrysost., *de sacerdot.*, iv. 8. S Aug., *de vera relig.* III. *seq.* S. Basil, *ep.* 49 on Julian. See Schultze, *Geschichte des Untergangs des griechisch-römischen Heidenthums*, 1887, pp. 164, 248.

* John VIII. 32.

comes from the God of life and of love; it is living and life-giving. All religions, and all faiths naturally make their chief appeal to the will. But none more so than Christianity. It clasps the will in its embraces, and holds the whole man in its grip. Its moral doctrines are stamped with the seal of the Spirit of God, within the reach of whose influence Christianity brings all men, even the lowest. But the command to spend life on earth in self-denial and self-abasement, in practising virtue, in acting from purity of intention, in living chastely, in loving neighbours, in despising things of time;—and all for the hope of eternal life—must have sounded unwelcome and harsh to Jewish ears; and to the heathen such a command must have seemed foolish beyond measure. What then was the secret of their success? These commandments harmonized with others in the depths of man's soul; they struck a chord, which had long ceased to give out a clear sound, but there it lay stretched in the human heart, waiting for the master's hand to temper and tune and touch it. And lo! What had been deemed impossible was enacted in the sight of all. Men of flesh and blood, exposed to danger and temptation, who, before their conversion, had drunk down iniquity like water; the despised class, women and slaves, the poor and the wretched, embraced these saving doctrines, and contentment, happiness and bliss ensued. Great, as the Psalms eloquently sing, was the peace the Israelites found in fulfilling the Law; but greater still was the inward joy that all true Christians experienced in fulfilling the new moral law; while to the heathen this joy became an evidence for Christianity. Into the heart of the disciples there entered not the peace of this world, which is no peace, but that peace which the world cannot give, the peace of our Divine Redeemer. Joyfully they went before the Sanhedrim and heathen courts, eager to suffer insults for the name of Jesus. Nor were the faithful less affected by the elevating power of God's word. The Acts of the Apostles give a vivid description of the faithful persevering with one mind in prayer, and in the breaking of bread;

they tell how the faithful loved their neighbours, and effaced themselves, in order to be all things to all men. Does not this show the force of the teaching and example of Jesus? As Jesus bade the Apostles remember that they were the salt of the earth and the light of the world, and that therefore they were to let their light shine before men so that others seeing their good works might glorify their Father who is in heaven,* so the Apostles, on their side, admonished the faithful, to be honourable in their conversation, in order that those without, seeing it, might give praise to God.

The new life they were leading proved to the Apostolic communities that they were in possession of the truth. To unbelievers, also, living in their midst, it appealed more forcibly than learned disquisitions could have done. For words only teach, but example draws. The example set by Christ, and reflected in the Apostles and the faithful, gave the greatest impetus to the spread of Christianity. "You are the seal of my apostleship in the Lord,"† wrote the Apostle to the Corinthians; and he needed no further letter of recommendation. And our Lord has said, that he that doeth his word sees that it is of God; and again, he says that the tree is known by its fruits. In the application of this last test, however, discretion is needed, as man's corrupt nature will put even the best things to vilest uses. *Corruptio optimi pessima.* Light and shade alternate in the history of Christianity. Statement is met by counter-statement; praise is seasoned with blame; and one complaint is discounted by another.[26] Fathers, like SS. Chrysostom and Augustine, complained bitterly because Christians no longer set a good example. "There would be no more heathen if we were true Christians." S. Paul though alone gained multitudes. "If we were all such, what worlds should we not have conquered?" How are the heathen to be

26 Weiss, *Apologie des Christenthums vom Standpuncte der Sittenlehre*, I. 2. S. Chrys., *in I. ep. ad Tim.*, *Hom.* x. 3. See Schultze, p. 315.

* Matth. v. 13.

† I. Cor., ix. 2.

converted now? "By pointing to miracles? They are "no more. By the example of our life? It is thoroughly "corrupt. By love? There is not a spark of love any-"where to be seen." Nevertheless, despite all this, this test must not be thrown overboard. Christianity cannot blot sin out of the world, because man's will is free; but it has instilled higher principles into human nature, and raised it to a higher level of civilization and morality, the foundations of which are laid in Christ's doctrine of the will of his Father who is in heaven.

From what has been said, we may infer what form the criterion of revelation will take, for those who were not contemporaries of its immediate organs. Till the Captivity, the Jews had an almost unbroken succession of the men of God, and Tradition helped to fill in the interstices. After the Captivity, indeed, the prophetic spirit ceased;* but the people, chastened in the school of suffering, believed so firmly in Jahve, and held the law in such esteem, that no force of temptation could persuade the mass of the people to apostatize. But with Christianity the case is different. Revelation closed with Christ. The Apostles were the last organs of revelation. With them revelation was completed. Signs and wonders rendered it credible. The question therefore arises: What criteria did the teachers of the post-apostolic Church offer for the truth of the doctrines they preached? One might feel inclined to suppose that they offered the written word, that most precious heirloom, as a sure touchstone. "A special means of "convincing an opponent of supernatural truth, lies in "the authority of Holy Scripture, which was divinely con-"firmed by miracles," says S. Thomas.[27] But copies of the New Testament were too little diffused at that time, to be of any use for such a purpose. The Apostolic Fathers, though often using them, do not mention them by name.

27 *C. gent.* I. 9.

* The statement of the author is, perhaps, too categorical. Whether all prophecy, or only the higher and regular kind, ceased under the second temple, is disputed by some learned writers; e.g., Franzelin, *De Scriptura*, Thesis xi., Coroll. II. *Tr.*

The one natural criterion to hand was the living memory of the Apostles who had passed away. In this lay the guarantee that faith and practice were continuous. A community that could point to an Apostolic origin and to Apostolic tradition was held to have proved itself to be in possession of truth. Churches, not founded by the Apostles, could show no surer proof of orthodoxy than agreement with the Apostolic Church. And, again, the agreement of the Apostolic Churches among themselves afforded security that the legacy of the Apostles had not been tampered with. Later on, when the Apostolic writings had been collected, and a copy found its way into the several Churches, they served as an easy test for the Apostolicity of doctrine. Still Christians found the best proof of the truth of Apostolic teaching in themselves. For they were living members of a living body. The life-blood of truth and grace coursed through their veins. In this they found peace and happiness; and they vied with one another in preaching charity, chastity and humility.[28]

The life led by the Christians was likewise a tower of strength against their enemies. It showed their doctrine to be divine. "It is not our words that are peculiar; but our eccentricity con- "sists in shewing forth our convictions by our deeds," says Athenagoras.[29] Others before him dwelt with admiration on the constancy displayed by the confessors of the faith. The blood of the martyrs became the seed, whence new crops of Christians were continually springing up.[30] "Do you not see that the "more they are persecuted, the more they propagate and flourish? "This cannot be the work of man, but the power of God is "manifested herein." So obvious, so life-like and, as it were, so palpable is this argument for the truth of Christian revelation,

28 Justin., *Apol.* I. pp. 14, 29. Tertull., *Apolog.* III. 39. Orig., *c. Cels*, II. p. 48. S. Thom.. *c. gent.*, 1. p. 6. See Hefele, *Theol. Quart.*, 1838, p. 37. Kuhn, ibid. 1860, p. 311.

29 *Legat. pro Christ.*, xi. xxxiii. Moehler, *Ges Schriften*, I., p. 214.

30 Tertull., *Apol.* c. L. Min. Felix, *Octav.* c. xx. *Ep. ad Diogn.*, c. vi. vii. Justin., *Dialog.*, p. 110. Lactant. *Instit.*, v. 13. Ambros., *Ep.* 18. Prudent., *ad Symmach*, II. p, 700. Moehler, I. p. 26.

that Origen, in the Preface to his Apology against Celsus, was emboldened to declare, that the scientific line of defence, suggested by Ambrose, would weaken rather than strengthen the natural fortifications of Christianity: the lives of Christians, and the power manifested in Jesus. These cannot fail to make an impression on all who are not hopelessly stupid.[31] All parties had formed a coalition against Christianity, and it must have fallen with a great crash, had not the hand of God aided it to escape and to conquer. The inner spiritual life led by Christians, and the outward profession of their faith caused Christianity to spread. No physical or moral force could, in the long run, successfully cope with this new power, at once moral and divine. Day by day the members of Christians swelled. They swarmed in the cities of the Roman Empire, and found their way into its villages and hamlets. Soon the heathen world lay at their feet. Surely, now they were justified in ascribing this wonderful result to a miraculous power inherent in their religion. For how could Christianity, trampled under the iron heel of princes, have shewn such marvellous powers of expansion, had not a higher power been latent in her? Only heaven-born truth and power could have effected such a transformation in heathen life and thought. Tertullian and Origen, Chrysostom and Augustine regard this accomplished living fact as affording an irresistible proof in favour of Christianity.

The crucial test applied by Gamaliel in the Sanhedrim was converted into a proof. "If this counsel or this work be of "men, it will come to nought. But if it be of God, you cannot "overthrow it; lest perhaps you be found even to fight against "God."* And so it came to pass that Jews and heathens were found fighting against God. But they could not thwart His work. After each fresh assault, it lifted up its head, and its bearing was even more noble and more majestic. Christianity conquered the world; and in the conquest the world saw the

31 *Praef.*, p. 3; See L. p. 69.
* Acts v. 38, 39.

finger of God. Then the world embraced Christianity. Was not this the greatest of all miracles?[32]

The Apostles converted the world by miracles. But, in later times, when miracles were no longer necessary,[33] this very conversion became at once the substitute and the surest proof of these early miracles. The Church had grown into a power that commanded respect. "Its compact hierarchy, its ecclesiastical polity, its liturgy, its international character, its unity, unbroken even in dogmatic controversies, made the Church appear to be a spiritual copy of the Roman Empire." "Its authority was firmer than that of the state, its discipline of a nobler kind, its external regime more humane. The head of the state stood to his subjects as a master to his servants, but the Church was as a mother to her children; at least so she wished to be, and generally it was so. To be at once strong and gentle—that was her ideal; and at this time it was realized by her best representatives, Ambrose in the West and Basil in the East." Small insignificant grains of mustard-seed had developed into a great tree, and the birds of the air were resting on its branches. Soon the heathens were so thunderstruck that they craved for a bare toleration, and writers like Symmachus and Libanius, casting aside the apologists' mantle, were content with the more humble rôle of *laudatores temporis acti*. Of the merits of the question the heathen multitude were sublimely ignorant. The gladsome faith and constancy of the martyrs, Augustine thinks, compares favourably with the conduct of the heathens. "Who among them," he says, "has not abjured at a legal sacrifice? Who among them, if caught worshipping an idol, has not cried out with a loud voice: "I did not do it! and was in terror of being brought

32 S. Hieron., Ep. 107. On *Junil. Afric.*, see Kihn, l.c., p. 328. On Origen, Moehler, *Patrol.* p. 529. On S. Chrysost., *c. jud. et gent.* See Schultze, p. 25; also Dante *Parad.*, xxiv. p. 106.

33 S. Thom., *c. gent.*, I., p. 6. See Kleutgen, *Theol.* III., pp. 397, 415. Denzinger, II., p. 327. Schultze, p. 323. On church and gentiles, p. 432. In a different sense Kant, *Relig.*, p. 180 *seq.*

"before the tribunal. Of such stuff are the disciples of the ' devil made."

Still it would be a mistake to suppose that the shewing forth of the spirit and power had wholly ceased at the death of the apostles. "By miracles the Church was founded, "and by miracles it will be sustained till Anti-Christ shall "come."[34] As with creation, so with miracles; both, in a sense, have ceased, and both continue. God is always wonderful in His works, whether in the world of nature or of spirit. He puts forth the might of His arm, when and where He will. Marvels, as the Fathers love to point out, are no longer necessary in our changed circumstances; nay, at times, they go so far as to say that not even a shadow of a miracle is left behind.[35] Nevertheless, so fully persuaded are they that the power of working miracles has not died out, that they avow themselves as eyewitnesses. Origen[36] mentions several miracles that he had seen. Augustine bears similar testimony. Some bishops at the Council of Nicæa, says Theodoret, possessed the *charismata* in a very high degree. The efficacy of the name of Jesus in casting out devils is referred to over and over again by the Fathers.[37] But the more Christianity spread, the less such external signs were needed. For now, more than at any other time, the saying holds good: miracles are worked not for the sake of the faithful but of unbelievers.[38] And even for unbelievers they were less needful, when other proofs came to hand. Nevertheless miracles have not been wholly superfluous. In no age of the Christian Church has the

34 Pascal, xxvii. 14.

35 S. Chrys., *de sacerd.*, iv. 3, p. 398; in I. *ep. ad Tim*, Homil., x. 3.

36 *C Cels.*, I. pp. 2, 46, 67; II. p. 8; III. pp. 24, 28. *In Joann.*, II. p. 28. *De princip.*, iv. 2. S. Aug., *de civ. Dei*, xxii. 8. *Retr.*, I. p. 13. Cf. Iren. II. pp. 32-4. Tertull., *de anima*, pp. 47, 51. *Apol.*, p. 23. Cyprian, *de lapsis*, 23 *seq.* Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 9. Athanas., *in vita S. Anton.*, pp. 54, 57. Hieron., *in vita Hilarionis*, p. 39. *Constit. Apost.*, viii. 1 *seq.* See Moehler, *Athanas.*, p. 226.

37 On Justin see Moehler, *Patrol.*, p. 204, and Origen, *c. Cels.*, I. p. 6.; III. p. 36; vii. 4. On Augustine see Schwane, *Dogmengeschichte*, II. p. 328.

38 See Edersheim, *Leben Jesu*, II. p. 169. Vosen, *Das Christenthum*, p. 714. Scheeben, *Dogmatik*, I. p. 472 *seq.* Kleutgen, II. 356 III. p. 384.

light of miracles been completely extinguished. The miracles of the nineteenth century, say Renan and others, rest on fraud or deception; therefore, they argue, the miracles of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in fine, all previous miracles, are equally baseless. Such an argument, besides trifling with the subject, begs the question.[39]

The appeal to miracles has always, from the time of the Israelites onwards, passed as a solid proof of revelation. From the beginning the God of the Covenant, besides being the Creator of the world, was also the Almighty wonder-worker, the God who did wonderful things for His chosen people. The Old Testament celebrates His wonderful deeds. What Jahve had accomplished through Moses was on the lips of all. "What sign therefore dost thou shew," said the Jews, "that we may see and believe thee? what dost thou work? "Our Fathers did eat manna." * "Art thou then greater "than our father Abraham, who is dead? and the prophets "who are dead?" † From this it is clear that the Jews placed past and present miracles on the same footing. In their eyes historical miracles were so sure a test that they could only be shaken by similar or greater signs.

The Apostles likewise appealed to earlier miracles. The only guarantee they had to offer for the faith they preached was the power and authority of Christ, who had worked miracles before their eyes. Their own faith being founded on Christ, as on a rock, they could not lay any other foundation for those who were to believe in their preaching. To Christ's authority and person, to his life and works they ever appealed. Even S. Paul, who judged all things spiritually, who taught that the resurrection of the body pales in importance before spiritual resurrection or regeneraton, would allow due weight to external proofs. The fact of Christ's resurrection is to him

39 See on the other hand Girodon, *Exposée de la doctrine catholique*, Paris, 1884, I. 39.

* John vi. 30.

† Ibid. iii. 53.

the proof of faith and the pledge of hope. If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and our hope is vain also. But now Christ is risen, the first-fruits of them that sleep; and of this, Peter, the Eleven, James, the Apostles, more than 500 disciples and S. Paul himself are witnesses. How then do some say that there is no resurrection? The apostles were appointed witnesses of the resurrection.* In his first sermon at Pentecost, S. Peter bears witness to Jesus as a man of God, approved by miracles, wonders and signs.† To the anxious Christians S. Peter writes: "I will do my endeavour that after my "decease you may also often have whereby you may keep "a memory of these things. For we have not followed "cunningly devised fables, when we made known to you "the power and presence of our Lord Jesus Christ; but "having been made eye-witness of his majesty. For he "received from God the Father, honour and glory; this "voice coming down to him from the excellent glory, This "is my beloved Son in whom I have pleased myself, hear "ye him. And this voice we heard brought from heaven, "when we were with him in the holy mount. And we "have the more firm prophetical word."‡

The spirit and power displayed by the Apostles were, to all who heard them, at least a mediate proof that the things they preached as eye-witnesses and ambassadors of God were true. They too, like Christ Himself, could testify to the Old Testament. Thus, to the testimony of the prophets and God's wonderful guidance of His people, the Apostles were able to add the testimony of Christ's authority. But in later times the proof was cast in a somewhat different form. The Fathers frequently point to the miracles that Jesus worked to prove his descent from the Father.[40] According to S. Athanasius, these miracles prove the mystery of the Incarnation, for only a God man could

40 Denzinger, II. p. 324.

* Acts I. 21.

† Ibid II. 22.

‡ II. Pet. i. 15-19.

work miracles by his own power, as Jesus did.[41] In Origen's time, many[42] said: Christ needs no other witnesses; for the salutary doctrines that he preached, and the wonderful works that he did, established belief in him. And S. Thomas says, that the proof drawn from the miracles recorded in Scripture is suitable for believers. For if proof be drawn from any other source, it may, indeed, afford consolation to the faithful; but it cannot convince unbelievers; and hence it would be a halting demonstration.[43]

Here, it is clear, the demands made upon faith are greater than those made by the Apostles. Not, indeed, as rationalists say, that miracles are only valuable in so far as they are believed.[44] Miracles, certainly have always been for signs; but to be signs they must first be miracles. Were they purely natural events, whose whole significance lay in the deep impression they made on the mind and heart of man, faith in them would be an illusion, alike for eye-witnesses and for posterity. Thus their force as proofs would be diluted in doubt. The appeal that "Greeks, Indians, Israelites and Christians" have for centuries made to old miracles was not a mere oratorical device necessary for success, but it was founded on firm faith in their reality, at least in the case of Jews and Christians. To say that they are now too infirm a prop to sustain Christianity, is to scatter to the winds the supernatural element in Christianity. Religion has more than an antiquarian interest; it is a living power, endowed with forces that are ever present and never slumber. Great orators and prophets, it is true, rest their appeal mainly on present events, and introduce what is old merely to strengthen the new. Are we acting otherwise when we apply the miracles of Christ and the Apostles as a criterion of revelation? We do not erect the whole fabric of Christianity on them alone. Nor, again, are we unmindful that Christianity

41 *Orat. adv. gent.*, p. 1. *De Incarn.*, p. 30. Cf. Gregor. Nyss., *Orat. cat.*, pp. 30, 31.

42 In Joan., p. 28.

43 *C. gent.*, I. p. 9.

44 Teichmüller, p. 185. Pfleiderer, I. p. 390.

is a power that is at once living and life-giving. But by measuring its achievements in the past as well as in the present, we are striving to make conviction doubly sure. Christianity is an historical religion. With Christ it began; from him it derives all its force. If it have a supernatural origin, the believer can not afford to disregard it. The denial of miracles is the centre whence rationalistic objections radiate. "If," says Renan, "miracles have any reality, my book is nothing but a "tissue of errors."[45]

And now we are brought face to face with a further consideration which, independently of the notion of miracles, seems to weaken or tone down the force of the proof we have been urging. The Scripture miracles are valid tests only if the Scriptures themselves are genuine and authentic records. Therefore the certainty of miracles as a criterion of revelation ultimately reposes on history, and hence the certitude it offers is only moral. For this reason the Traditionalists were up in arms and spiked the proof, by urging that the assumption that sacred writers did not err would itself be a miracle.[46] There might be some force in this objection, were it asserted that a perfect demonstration were encased in this proof. But between absolute proof and no proof at all there lies a wide expanse. Miracles receive a large accession of strength from prophecy. Jesus, as we have seen, combined the two proofs; and the apostles did in like manner in regard to the wonderful incidents in the life of Jesus. S. Peter did it in his Pentecost sermon before before the assembled Jews, and S. Paul before Jew and heathen. Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.*

The Fathers walked in their footsteps Origen himself poses as an objector in order to win over those who would not be convinced by the proof from prophecy, because Moses and the prophets, though without prophetic evidence to fall

45 P. v. 13th Ed. See Pawlicki, *Entstehung des Christenthums*, p. 160.
46 See Denzinger, I. p. 143.
* I. Corinthians, xv. 3. 4.

back upon, had been believed.[47] Still he thinks that two proofs are better than one, and he rejoices that Christianity is lapped in proofs for drawing men to the faith. Many unmoved, say by the proof from miracles, are led captive by another. Many, he says, have been won to Christ by the prophecies, being deeply impressed by the fact that many prophets, who lived long before, had foretold Christ's birthplace and abode, his teaching and his miracles, his passion and his resurrection. Nor should it be forgotten that extraordinary manifestations of power, though sufficient to enlist the contemporaries of Christ in the army of believers, were not afterwards so forcible as proofs, because some went so far as to brand them as fables. But miracles and prophecy welded into one form a complete armoury of proof, because prophecy is a safeguard against disbelief in miracles. Moreover, by dwelling on the theological importance of prophecy, fulfilled and confirmed in Jesus, Origen, in his own profound and masterly way, shows the necessity of joining external criticism to internal.[48]

It is quite certain that the miracles of the New Testament are not a superstructure raised upon the prophecies of the Old, as the advocates of the myth hypothesis imagine; but, on the other hand, it is equally certain, when the prophecies were fulfilled, that miracles, independently of the Scriptures, formed, as it were, a proof of the Christian revelation, and a confirmation of the revelation in the Old Testament. This was exactly the light in which the ancient Churches for the most part read and studied the Old Testament.

Thus, it may be said that the miracles worked by Christ, the Apostles, and the Saints, were necessary in the first ages, because the prophecies had not been fulfilled,[49] and that they are no longer necessary, because prophecies fulfilled are a

47 Thus the Gnostics; see Denzinger, I. p. 305.

48 Origen, *c. Cels.*, vii. [illegible] Moehler, *Patrol.*, p. [illegible]

49 Pascal, xiv. 4.

standing miracle. Or, it would be better to say that miracles, when confirmed by prophecy, are an adequate test of revelation. If it be said that in the beginning miracles were necessary as a means of recognizing[50] truth, this must not be interpreted to mean that the facts of the miracles must make way for arguments from reason. If miracles are admitted at all, and all reasonable men admit them, they must have happened at least in the first days of revealed religion. Again, if certain governments, while granting that miracles happened of old, do not permit new ones, they concede, at any rate, that Christianity without miracles is inconceivable. Holy Scripture does not warrant the distinction between past and present. Still to contend that miracles are in some sense no longer necessary is not a mere evasion. Nay, the distinction is, in a manner, implied in those passages of the New Testament, in which Jesus and the Apostles refer to the miracles in the Old Testament.

So, we are again brought face to face with the joint proof from miracles and prophecies. The distinction we have drawn leaves prophecies untouched, for they are effective proof for all time. Celsus dismissed the Christian's appeal to prophecies fulfilled in the life of Jesus, and would not permit any test to be applied to Christ but one's innate idea of God. In reply Origen says: Although Celsus feels that prophecies concerning Jesus are an important factor in carrying conviction, he seeks to pulverise them with the off-hand remark: "Whether the prophets foretold this or not is not to the point. To be candid he should say: It cannot be proved that these things were predicted, or that what was predicted of the Messias was fulfilled in Jesus."[51] In the same way, Schleiermacher could never understand what good was to be derived from proving Christ from prophecy. Why not appeal also to Plato's just man, or to Lao-tse's Messias? Because Plato never foretold that such an one was to come, but merely

50 Kant, *Relig.*, p. 180.
51 *C. Cels.*, vii. 14.

insisted that in him lay the only hope of moral regeneration. In this sense we have appealed to Plato. Except for the Jews, the Manichæans denied the validity of the proof from prophecy. For, they said, if Christ is to be proved from the prophets, some warranted sanction for belief in the prophets is necessary. But such necessity would arise only in the supposition that the prophets, living a long time before Christ, had thrown out nothing but dark hints. If even Socrates believed that oracles and miracles rank as the greatest benefits that the gods, in their solicitude for man's welfare, have conferred on the human race, Christians need not look askance at this proof.

For the faithful, then, and for the organs of revelation, both internal and external tests are available, which prove that the charge of unreasonableness is unfounded. They are, moreover, positive, although the certitude they produce is but moral. While strengthening and setting the faithful at rest, they likewise prepare the way for faith, but do not extort it by force. If faith in truths above reason, rested solely on the necessary and irresistible conviction that God had revealed such truths, because miracles had accompanied them, then faith would, under the circumstances, be but a natural and necessary act; and the soul would not thereby be raised above the natural level of its thoughts.[53] Lugo tilted against this teaching of S. Thomas, and assigned, in the very motive of faith, a subordinate place to the conviction of the credibility of revelation derived from miracles. Such, no doubt, in point of fact, is the ordinary process of conversion. The Gospel centres in an historic Christ. It is this fact which most profoundly impresses hearers and readers. The life of Jesus is, and will ever remain, the strongest motive of Christian belief. "Jesus and his disciples wished men to believe not so much in his divinity "and his miracles, as that he had united human nature "to himself. . . . . For they knew that salvation

53 S. Thom., II. II. Q. v. a. 2. Schwane, l.c. III. p. 61.

"comes to those who, to belief in divine things, join the belief "that a divine power, in condescension to man's infirmity, had "assumed a human soul and a human body. From this they "learn that the divine and human natures were united in him, "in order that human nature, by being associated with the "divine, might in turn become divine, not in Jesus only, but in "all who cultivate God's friendship and fellowship, by following "the rule of life taught by Jesus Christ and keeping his com- "mandments." [54] External and internal credibility combined are, indeed, an evidence of the fact of revelation, but not of the intrinsic credibility of the truths revealed. That evidence proves with certainty that God is speaking or has spoken through man; it can lead the mind from the human instrument to the divine author; but it can never generate divine faith, or take the place of faith in the heart of man. "Faith is the "substance (i.e. the argument, or reason or ground) of things "to be hoped for; the evidence of things that appear not; for "by this the ancients obtained a testimony."* Reason precedes, faith follows. But, to a man, once reasonably convinced by the motives of credibility, faith comes as a new principle of knowledge; it is a gift, a grace, and an act of theological virtue. Thus it is true to say: *intelligo ut credam*, and equally true to to say, *credo ut intelligam*. Fathers and Schoolmen lay stress now on one, now on the other, according as they wish to give prominence to the motives of faith, or to the knowledge that comes through faith. Whatever judgment may be formed as to the general question of the criteria of truth, this much is certain that there must be some criteria; or knowledge must be a blind assent. Moreover, he who has preserved faith in God and his divine veracity, will never allow that a lie can bear all the marks of truth. And he must furthermore allow, that the majority of human sciences do not rest solely on knowledge in the strictest

54 Orig., *c. Cels.*, III. p. 28. On the historic part see Schmid, l.c. p. 250. Denzinger, I. pp. 124, 159, 318; II. pp. 33, 319, 487. Kleutgen, III. p. 352. On S. Anselm see Moehler, *Ges. Schriften*, I. p. 137.

* Hebr. xi. 1-2.

sense of the term. Hence we must not be surprised if, in the criteria of revelation, knowledge meets faith, and faith natural and supernatural are mutually entwined.

The Holy See promulgated the following theses against the Traditionalism of Bautain: * "The use of reason precedes "faith, and aided by revelation and grace leads man to faith. "Reason is able to prove with certainty the authenticity of "revelation as given to the Jews by Moses, and to Christians by "Jesus Christ." And the Vatican Council teaches: † "Never-"theless, in order that the obedience of our faith might be in "harmony with reason, God willed that to the interior help of "the Holy Spirit, there should be joined exterior proofs of His "revelation; to wit, divine facts, and especially miracles and "prophecies, which, as they manifestly display the omnipotence "and infinite knowledge of God, are most certain proofs of His "divine revelation, adapted to the intelligence of all men. "Wherefore, both Moses and the Prophets, and most "especially Christ our Lord Himself, shewed forth many and "most evident miracles and prophecies; and of the Apostles we "read: 'But they going forth preached everywhere, the Lord "'working withal, and confirming the word with signs that "'followed' (Mark xvi. 20). And again, it is written: 'We "'have the more prophetical word, whereunto you do well to "'attend, as to a light shining in a dark place'" (II. Peter i. 19). And in Canon 3 to this chapter it says: "If any one shall say that "divine revelation cannot be made credible by outward signs, "and therefore that men ought to be moved to faith solely by "the internal experience of each, or by private inspiration; let "him be anathema."

* See Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, No. 1492. 1493. 1507. *Tr.*

† Session III. Chapter iii.—The translation is taken from Card. Manning's *Petri Privilegium.*

CHAPTER X.

MIRACLES.

Both man and nature are attired in wonder. Everyday a panorama of wonders is passing before our eyes, and if we no longer stand rapt in wonder at them, it is because they are familiar, not because we have unlocked their mystery. The light and movements of the heavens, the marvels great and small that people the animal world, the luxuriant world of plants, so delicate and artistic in structure, the fresh and fragrant flowers that adorn and beautify the earth would strike us mute with wonder, if we had not been familiar with them from youth upwards. From first to last, the history of man himself, alternately favoured and thwarted by crooked fortune, and often torn asunder by contrary ends and interests, against the level of his aim, is to human reason an enigma, a miracle.[1]

To the ancients generally, and especially to believers, miracles and prophecy seemed self-evident, and to stand in no need of proof. To them it seemed impossible to exaggerate the closeness of the union that religion established between God and man, or to be mistaken in supposing that God's almighty power was at work in nature. In all ages men have prayed to their gods, in the hope of being heard and succoured in temporal and spiritual needs. Not the idea of the supernatural, but to determine nature's limits, was the problem that perplexed the men of old. In their eyes, oracles were a living and a speaking reality;

1 Aug. *In Joann.* Tr. xxiv. 1.

and God's action in nature and the soul a necessary corollary of his existence. So thoroughly human is this way of looking at things, that even unbelievers speak of wonderful events, though they cannot exactly say why. Hence, as belief in the supernatural was universal, the Fathers of the Church did not feel specially called upon to dwell upon this truth. Miracles, as such, were not challenged. Even the avowed adversaries of Christianity discharged their arrows, not at the miracles themselves, but at their credibility and significance. The Fathers, although ascribing heathen miracles and prophecies to the power of the devil, did not deny their existence.

Only when the age of reflection and philosophic scepticism had set in, were rigid and precise definitions a necessity. As men were gradually opening their eyes to a distinction between the laws of nature and God's action in creation and revelation, they became alive to the need of finding a precise formula to express the distinction. The speculative and far-seeing Augustine was the first to take the task in hand. With a view to solving the difficulties that he discerned looming in the distance, he began to ponder on God and nature, on the Creator and his work, and to investigate the relations in which the law of nature and the Lord of nature stand to each other.[2] The scholastics, hard pressed by rationalists and pantheists, followed in his wake. And modern apologists must be armed from head to foot, because since Deism and so-called enlightenment dawned on the world, miracles have been the main point assailed. The denial of miracles is the starting-point of modern rationalists, who hold it as a firmly fixed principle that miracles have no more a place in human affairs than in events of nature.[3] Human actions, they say, must be explained in a human way. Here, again, ontologists make common cause with rationalists. Ontologists deprecate any critical examination of miracles,

2 *De civ. Dei*, xxi. 8. *De Gen.* vi. 13, 2.

3 Renan, *Etude de l'hist. relig.* 7 ed. Paris, 1884, p. vii. *Revue de l'hist. des relig.* 1886, p. 306.

because they hold that miracles are significant in their bearings, not on historical events but only on faith. A miracle, they say, was never intended to be an object of historical faith; it rests wholly on its own internal credibility.

"To conceive and treat a miracle as an historical event is to "subject it to criticism, which, as a rule, can admit no facts but "those founded on intuition or experience. Christ did not wish "the miracles worked by him to be regarded as historical facts; "and therefore he withdrew himself, after his resurrection, from "the gaze of all, thus placing the truth of the resurrection out-"side the pale of juridical enquiry. Stories of miracles are "not to be conceived as history but as prophecies and palingen-"etical predications."[4]

A miracle (*miraculum, mirari = to wonder*) is generally described as an extraordinary sensible effect, having its cause, not in the order of nature as known to us, but in God. "The name miracle signifies wonder. Now wonder arises "when we know not the cause of that which we see. Thus, an "eclipse of the sun would create wonder in one who knew not "what caused it It may, however, often happen that the cause "of some sensible effect may be known to one and unknown to "another; whence a thing may be wonderful to one and not "another. Thus the eclipse of the sun is wonderful to the rus-"tic but not to the astronomer. But a miracle denotes that "which is full of matter for wonder, that is, whose cause is hid-"den from all men. That cause is God. Hence all things "done by God outside the chain (*præter*) of causes known to "us, are called miracles."[5*] Sometimes S. Thomas also describes miracles as "contrary to nature," but he repeatedly gives us to understand that he is not using the term "*Contra*,"

4 Gioberti apud Werner, *Der Ontologismus als Philosophie des rationalen Gedankens.* Wien, 1885, p. 203.

5 S. Thom., I. Q. cv. a. 7. cx. a. 4. cf. I. II. Q. cxiii. a. 10. See Brischar, *Der Wunderbegriff des heil. Thomas.* in *Theol. Quart.*, 1845, p. 262.

* We have given in the text the complete passage of St. Thomas instead of the author's *resumé*. *Tr.*

in its strictest sense. It was Erigena who blended both the "*prater naturam*" and the "*contra naturam,*" as necessary elements in the idea of a miracle. He was followed by Scotus, Occam, and Descartes, although S. Augustine had already turned the popular "*contra naturam,*" into the more correct theological expression, "*contra quam est nota natura.*"

God, in all His works has a higher end in view. In God freak and caprice are as unthinkable as compulsion and necessity. Will the case be otherwise with miracles? Must not their purpose be the chief thing aimed at? The purpose for which miracles are worked is generally included in the definition. And that purpose is to strengthen faith, to make men holy, to lead them to God, and to give them a relish for divine things. This is abundantly clear from the Scripture miracles. Was their purpose to heal sickness or relieve misery? Did Jesus, like the priests of nature-religions and Islam dervishes work miracles to provide entertainment to the bystanders? Such, indeed, was the object, of some miracles recorded in the apocryphal gospels. But Jesus avoided such theatrical displays. By unbelief he was debarred from working miracles, and he discouraged undue haste in publishing abroad his wonderful works.[6] It must ever be steadily borne in mind that miracles in the physical world were not to prejudice or to oust miracles from the moral and spiritual world. For the former, though apparently unshackled by moral condition, are still subservient to some ethical purpose, howsoever remote it be. In a word, man is their goal; for his sake they are worked. The greater the miracle, the more surely and efficaciously is the end attained. Nor are the physical miracles of the Old Testament any exception to his rule. Moses' miracles in Egypt were called the plagues of Egypt. Why? Because they were sent, not to gratify idle curiosity, but as a chastisement to break Pharaoh's opposition. People and country were condemned to suffer at the

6 Math. xii. 39 seq. xvi. Mark i. 43; v. 43; vii. 37; viii. 12, 26. Luke xi. 29; xxiii. 8. John II. 18; iv. 48; vi. 30 *seq.* See Schanz, *Commentar über das Evang. des h. Marcus*, Freiburg, 1881, pp. 41, 112.

hands of the elements, because Pharaoh could not be prevailed upon to let the Israelites go. At the same time these miracles confirmed the Israelites' trust in Jahve, and proved to them the divine mission of Moses. The miracles worked at the Red Sea and in the wilderness had also a divine purpose,—to educate in the fear of God a people, whose minds had been stained by Egyptian idolatry. Far from being arbitrary and capricious, these miracles have been interwoven with the very history of the Jews as a nation, and cannot be disentangled from their religious thoughts and sentiments.

At one time, the miracles of Jesus, recorded in the gospels, were viewed solely as manifestations of his divine power. His miracles, owing to his divine nature and person, were looked upon, so to speak, as the natural outcome and expression of his divinity and omnipotence. The apocryphal gospels show how widely this view had gained acceptance. But the Fathers of the Church, and the Church herself, condemned these gospels, not merely because of John II. 11, and heretical abuses, but because they contained childish stories which were at variance with the noble and dignified and earnest character that the gospels ascribe to Jesus, even as a boy. But, it will be asked, is it not recorded by the Evangelists themselves that virtue went forth from Jesus to heal the sick?* We may, in reply, push the question a step farther. Is it not recorded in the *Acts*† that the sick were healed by kerchiefs and aprons, and even by the shadow of the Apostles? And does it thence follow that the kerchiefs and shadows worked miracles of their own power? To say the least, this is a very questionable method of throwing out a dark hint as to the possibility of a fetich superstition. Holy Scripture does not warrant the assumption that such power was capricious or mechanical either in Jesus or in the Apostles. The letter of Scripture must be distinguished from the

* Mark v. 30—Luke vi. 19; viii. 46.

† Acts v. 12; xix. 12.

spirit and meaning. Such an impression might be produced on the person healed or on the spectators, but not on the workers of the miracles. They were not the blind tools of omnipotence, nor is omnipotence ever shorn of the wisdom that is resplendent in all God's works. Jesus once said that he knew virtue had gone forth from him. Under what circumstances was this said? Does any one suppose that Jesus did not know beforehand what he was going to do? In most other miracles recorded of him, even when he walked on the sea and multiplied the loaves, his freedom of operation, and the spiritual end he had in view, are plainly set forth. By the former he designed to strengthen the faith of the disciples, and to increase their confidence in him; by the latter he sought to win the people to the faith, and to reward them for persevering in listening to his discourses. But what about the destruction of two thousand swine by the devils cast out at Gerasa? At first blush this seems a doubtful case. But the difficulty grows less, once we unfix our gaze from the material loss, which, not knowing its circumstances, we cannot accurately appreciate, either objectively or relatively. To the spectators, the connection between unclean spirits and unclean animals, might well have served as an impressive and instructive object-lesson. As regards the miraculous cures no difficulty whatever hovers over their ethical purpose. They served a triple religious purpose: for the persons healed, for the people, and for the spectators. Pity, it is true, is often the ostensible motive, and a great concourse of people was often excluded; but we hold that the effect overshot the motive. How could the pedagogical prudence of the master wholly prevent the fame of his great deeds being spread abroad? The people praised God who had given such power to men.

Jesus himself repeatedly points out the end and purpose of his miracles: they were a means of carrying out the divine plan of salvation. Of the man born blind, he said that he was so born that the works of God might be made manifest in him; and he described the sickness of Lazarus

as a sickness not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified in it. In both cases faith in Jesus is mentioned as the immediate effect of the miracle.* This purpose of the miracles of Jesus is set forth with especial prominence in the gospel of S. John, who even goes so far as to say that it embraced all who through the gospel should come to the knowledge of Jesus' miracles. "Many other signs also did Jesus in the sight "of his disciples which are not written in this book. But "these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the "Christ the Son of God; and that believing you may have "life in his name."† Hence, too, John often explicitly states that he was an eye-witness, and he recalls his fiduciary relations with Jesus. His detailed descriptions of certain striking miracles and their effects point in the same direction. But similar indications are not wanting in the gospels of Mark and Luke.[9] The case is rather different in the Gospel of Matthew, in which discourses and narratives are grouped together and alternate with the miracles. But whenever he touches upon prophecies, the same end is also perceptible in his gospel.[10]

Miracles, then, are fraught with a higher purpose; they occupy a place in the scheme of God's providence, and are necessarily signs for furthering the religious and moral life. They lead to faith, without finding it. Their purpose is to bring under the notice of men, the worship of the one God, in which alone consists eternal life.[11] When worked by godly and virtuous men, they give a recommendation to truth and holiness. Faith cannot, it is true, rest on miracles alone; but is that a reason for discrediting and rejecting miracles alto-

9 See Schanz, *Commentar etc. in Marc.*, pp. 40, 91, 258, 272. *In Luc.*, pp. 266, 271, 371, 423. See also Pascal, xxvii. 2.

10 Schanz, *Comment. . . . in Math.*, pp. 332, 484.

11 Aug. *de civ. Dei*, x. p. 12.

* John ix. 38—Ibid. xi. 45.

† John xx. 30.

gether? Not even in Thomas' case* did Jesus so act. From the purpose underlying miracles Origen argued that Scripture miracles were true and heathen miracles false. Celsus sought to establish a parallel between Christ and Aristeas, because, although Aristeas worked many wonders, no one believed him to be God. Origen, in reply, gives reasons for discrediting the whole story, from first to last. "What end," he says, "could "Providence have had in view in working miracles for Aristeas? "What benefit did he wish thereby to confer on the human "race? To this question there is no answer. But for the "miracles of Jesus we can give the most valid reasons. God "wished through Jesus to teach men the doctrine of salvation. "This doctrine, built indeed on the foundation of the apostles, "was in future ages to spread, and then many miracles, not to "be spurned, were wrought in the name of Jesus."[12]

This general statement, however, like the teleological argument from nature and providence, must be applied cautiously, and not be pressed too closely. For human reason, both one and the other are beset with difficulties; for God's ways and thoughts are not as man's. How can man, with his short range of vision, presume to pry into all the deep purposes of God? It seems to us, therefore, that the teleological element, though most important for forming a judgment on the miracle, is best omitted from the definition. Still less willing are we to sacrifice the chief factor in the idea of a miracle to the teleological or, indeed, to any psychological element.[13] If it be true, that miracles are called signs (σημεῖα, *signa*) because of the relation in which they stand to their purpose, surely, the idea of a miracle is already implied. That such is really the case is perfectly clear from Holy Scripture. Our chief authority for the use of the word is the fourth gospel, and, in the teeth of John iv. 48, we have no right to set aside an

12 *C. Cels.*, III. p. 28.

13 Teichmüller, p. 189. Spinoza, Kant, Schleiermacher, Hase, and others. See Denzinger, II. pp. 335, 342.

* John xx. 29.

indubitable fact of Scripture in favour of a mere verbal analysis. We must not put an historical narrative out of joint by a violent dialectic wrench.[14] In a "religion of fear," belief in some miracles may have originated in this way; certain events may conceivably lend themselves readily to a religious interpretation, and thus be stamped as religious events or miracles. S. Thomas derives *monstra* from *monstrare*, *ostenta* from *ostendere*, *portenta* from *portendere*, i.e. *præ-ostendere*, *prodigia* from *porro dicere* i.e. *prædicere*. May we therefore infer that the main element in a miracle lies in its significance to man? But, it is objected, in a "religion of fear," miracles are never worked for the purpose of proving abstract dogmatic truths; e.g. that the gods are mighty, and can break through nature's laws. This we grant; but we submit, in turn, that this is nevertheless an indispensable preliminary truth, without which no believer, even in a religion of fear, could conceive a miracle as an event with significance to himself. Otherwise he must regard all events as miracles. The Jews, in fact, who had some share in the religion of fear, appealed to Jahve's miracles in proof of his omnipotence and sovereign dominion. The essence of a miracle may be said to lie in its significance, in so far as the divine power working a miracle, necessarily acts with a purpose. In this, therefore, and not in any defect in the supernatural character of the events, lies the reason why prophets do not work miracles in their own country, and why miracles are worked only where they are believed, that is, where men are disposed to give effect to the end for which they are worked. Here and there, a purely natural event, as being a sign or word from God, may be construed into a miracle; for God nowhere leaves himself without testimony. But true miracles are not such, and the Scripture miracles, at any rate, cannot be thus explained away, as parables or allegories; for the descriptions given by the sacred writers are too vivid and too realistic.[15] The

14 Schanz, *Comment.* . . . *in Joh.* Tübingen, 1885, pp. 25, 39. S. Thom., II. II. Q. clxxviii. a. 1–3. See Denzinger, I. p. 88.

15 Woolston ap. Denzinger, I. p. 185. Weizsäcker, *Apostol. Zeitalter*, Freiburg, 1887, p. 409.

old idea of a miracle is proof against such explanations.

The primary element, then, in a miracle lies in its being a sensible sign, a sign that strikes the senses, and thus it is distinguished from so-called spiritual miracles and miracles of grace. In this distinction, however, no appreciation of their respective values is included. All that is meant is that these sensible signs are usually called miracles, because they are peculiarly adapted to awaken wonder and astonishment in man,—a being compounded of sense and reason; while miracles in the spiritual life, are worked, as a rule, in the soul of man, according to laws laid down by God,[16] and are only visible to the outer world in their effects, or when (as in the conversion of Saul) joined with external signs. Miracles, then, are a test of revelation, only inasmuch as they are signs that strike the senses. As the natural knowledge of God is first awakened in us by the perception of sensible things, so miracles serve to arouse and strengthen supernatural faith. It matters not what sort of an outward sign miracles are, since there is not, as in the Sacraments, an internal relation between the sign and the effect. And yet, even in a miracle, the character of the external event is not altogether a matter of indifference. For the miraculous character becomes more or less apparent and striking according to the different forms it assumes. Some have at least an analogy with human science; e.g. the healing of the sick, which merely oversteps the limits of ordinary known causes. Others, e.g. restoring sight to the blind and raising the dead, take life and health for a model, and are beyond the power of any one particular natural agency.[17] Others, again, wholly transcend the common order of things, and seem to contradict the entire course of nature.

Such a gradation of miracles is purely external, and is based, not upon any difference in the power of God, which is everywhere the same, but upon a diversity of outward visible signs.

16 S. Thom., I. II. Q. cxiii. a. 10; III. Q. xliv. a. 3 ad 1st et 3rd.
17 S. Thom., l.c. et I. Q. cv. a. 8.

Miracles must not be valued in proportion to their apparent hugeness or absurdity.[18] On the other hand it is equally wrong to regard every event in life and nature as natural—not only to eliminate the trivial and absurd element (a somewhat superfluous labour in the Scripture miracles), but to rob the external event of all its extraordinary and striking characteristics. For ordinary events leave no lasting impression on the mind; to create surprise and awaken wonder something extraordinary is required. And therefore only that which seldom happens, is unusual, and out of the way, is strictly a miracle. We are wonder-wounded only when things turn out contrary to expectation. Even in the "religion of fear" this is an essential. Nor were the Jews, or the Apostles, or the faithful indifferent to external signs. With the resurrection of Christ, which is ever being dinned into our ears as proof positive to the contrary, we shall deal in detail later on. God might, it is true, if he pleased, make known the greatest truths by the frailest means. He might, if He had been so pleased, have set up on high in the world a life of all-surpassing force and blessedness, by means of faith in mysteries, which would carry conviction, though they bore but few marks of credibility.[19] The apostles, however, thought otherwise, especially in regard to the resurrection. Of what weighty import, in their eyes, was this "straw," "this fact resting on such slender columns of "credibility!" Here the matter is inseparable from the form. Not even S. Paul, with all his fondness for spiritual meanings, would let go the material fact. He had a conscious belief in the power of miracles,* but his faith would have collapsed without actual proof, although the actual fact itself in part rested on faith. The attempt to explain the Pauline miracle of the resurrection as purely subjective is ever foredoomed to failure. Had the apostle merely intended to disclose the

18 Teichmüller, p. 181. See Denzinger, I. p. 88. S. Thom. *de Pot.* Q. vi. a. 2; I. Q. cv. a. 7.

19 Teichmüller, p. 189.

* I. Cor. ii. 4; xii. 9. 28. 33. II. Cor. xii. 12.

"mystery of the eternal significance of personality," and to create a new system of Christian metaphysics in which the "so-called objects of sense should become transitory relations "of things, and to show forth the ecstatic vision of the eternal "world of reality," then he is chasing a phantom and beating the air. In the course of our enquiry we shall endeavour to show how things extraordinary, but natural, may be discriminated from things supernatural and miraculous. It is, however, theologically certain that to discard the notion of sensible signs, is to abandon all proof of miracles, and to throw overboard the biblical narrative itself.

The first characteristic of a miracle is, that the sensible sign is neither produced by any known natural causes, nor results from the ordinary course of events. It must, therefore, be above nature, and have for its cause no power but that of God. For the modern apologist this is a point of supreme importance, though it hardly entered into the calculations of the ancients. They drew no distinction between the divine laws that govern nature in its ordinary course, and the divine will interfering for a special purpose in particular cases. Still less did they dream that the two could be mighty opposites. A distinction between the divine will, stamped on the order of nature, and a superior will, asserting itself by breaking through that order, was to the Jew unthinkable. He knew of no inviolable order of nature. Rain, storm, sunshine, thunder and lightning were God's doing. Between ordinary events and miracles he saw no qualitative distinction in kind. Both were, in his eyes, manifestations of God's power; but the miracle, being less usual and therefore greater, produced a stronger impression. From first to last, nature and miracles were conceived as dominated by the Creator's almighty power. "We speak," says St. Augustine, "of all *portenta* being contrary to nature; but in reality it is "not so. For, since all things by nature do the Creator's will, "how can that be against nature which happens by God's will? "A *portentum*, therefore, is not contrary to nature herself, but

"only to nature as she is known to us." Thus an event, inexplicable except by God's omnipotence, has an essentially distinctive mark. Once its origin and course are known, it ceases to be miraculous.* As God could create what natures he would, so he can transform the natures he has made, as he wills. S. Thomas[21] says with Augustine: "God the Creator of all things "does nothing against nature, because what he does is the "nature of everything." Hence it is incorrect to say, that the "schoolmen were the first to introduce the idea that miracles "are contrary to the laws of nature . . . which are the will "of God impressed upon our globe,"[22] unless, with the Scholastics, we explain Augustine's expression to mean: All things have an *ordo obedientialis* to God, by whom they were created. He can do with them what he will. If S. Thomas nevertheless retains the distinction into miracles, *supra*, *contra*, *præter naturam*,[23] it is only to characterize the different sensible signs or effects in nature. Though God sometimes works quite outside the established order of nature, he certainly does nothing contrary to nature; unless by nature be meant a particular thing or order of things, outside which God can work. Nothing that God does is against nature, for God is *actus purus*, *principale agens*, *prima mensura essentiæ*. He could have made a different order of nature, and hence he can work outside the present order.[24] To the first class of miracles S. Thomas assigns the Incarnation and the glorification of the body; to the second, the children in the fiery furnace, and the Virgin bringing forth a Son; to the third, the frogs in Egypt.

Last century, the term "contrary to nature" was generally claimed as part of the notion of a miracle, and it is still retained by many writers;[25] but, according to the more

21 S. Thom., III. Q. xliv. a. 2 ad 1 in; I. Q. cv. a. 6.
22 Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, Leipzig, 1876, p. 105.
23 *De Pot.* vi. (de miraculis) a. 2 ad 3. See Brischar, l.c. p. 266. Wisdom, xvi. 17.
24 S. Thom., I. Q. cv. a. 6.; cx. a. 4. cxiv. a. 4. *de pot.* vi. a. 1; *c. gent.* III 100.
25 Denzinger, II. pp. 358, 395. Hettinger, *Apologetik*, I. p. 217.
* Rom. xi. 24.

precise modern definition of the forces and laws of nature, and also according to the more exact distinction between creation and conservation, it is not now held to enter into the idea of a miracle. The notion of a miracle would be shorn of all real meaning, if every extraordinary and surprising event, even when its origin can be accounted for, were described as a miracle. On the other hand, it is giving a miracle more than its due to explain it as an event which completely breaks through all nature's laws.[26] What is required is that the effect should happen *præter naturam*, or in the words of S. Thomas, *præter ordinem totius naturæ creatæ*, and that it cannot be explained by the ordinary course of nature.[27] A miracle may consist of natural facts, miraculous in their union; it may be a new relation of the elements brought about by the action of God, to whom as creatures they belong, and on whom, as secondary causes on the first cause, they depend. Even so, a miracle, in a manner, contradicts nature; but the contradiction lies rather in the understanding than in the event itself. For instead of regarding the interference as the work of the Creator utilizing the existing laws of nature to produce a higher effect, the mind is apt to think that all things must be in contradiction with the known forces of nature which cannot be explained by them.

Furthermore, be it noted, the notion of a true miracle requires that it be caused, not merely, as in all extraordinary natural events, by the divine power in general, but by a special act of divine power, acting either mediately or immediately, that is either with or without the intervention of creatures. It acts immediately in the so-called absolute miracles, for which nature furnishes very slight, if any, analogy; and mediately, in the case of events which natural forces, with the aid of human art and science

26 Lotze, *Mikrokosmos*, II. p. 53.

27 Kleutgen, *Das Evang. des h. Math; Nebst einer Abhandlung über das Wunderbare.* Freiburg, 1882, p. 244.

might also bring about, if longer time were allowed. In these latter, either a natural effect is obtained surely and instantaneously without the ordinary means, or the power of natural forces is raised and increased. Extraordinary events compassed, e.g. by angels or devils, are not strictly miracles, for, although they exceed the power of some created natures, they do not transcend the *whole order of nature*. Hence the Scholastics drew a distinction between particular natures and all nature. Naturally, they were unable to find their way out of the labyrinth of the old view, which riveted attention on the various beings rather than on the laws of nature. Still, S. Thomas argues,[28] unless all nature be included, the throwing of a stone into the air would be a miracle, because it is against a stone's nature to mount on high.

But can a divine cause produce such effects? Is not all investigation of nature thereby placed in jeopardy? In ancient times Sceptics and Pantheists strenuously maintained that miracles were impossible. And since the rise of Deism, this denial has been the watchword of all the forces drawn up in battle array against Christianity. It is the war-cry of Spinoza, Hume and the entire pantheistic and semi-pantheistic host. It is the pæan of modern rationalists and pantheists, who regard the impossibility of miracles as self evident. Neither mechanical nor idealistic Monism, nor shallow Deism, nor Dualism can give truce or quarter to miracles. For the Monist sees in all things a necessary evolution, either material or spiritual, of universal being, while the Deist banishes God, after creation, to an airy region beyond the universe. The one point in which all these systems agree is in denying, or setting aside, or scrupulously avoiding all reference to the supernatural. For, as science is bounded by nature, and as all but experience and sense-perceptions are beyond its ken, concern about the supernatural is considered beneath the dignity of a scientific man. And, in truth, the theist's standpoint is the only one from which miracles

28 S. Thom., I. Q. cx. a. 4; *c. gent.*, III. p. 102. See Denzinger, I. p. 35; II. p. 422.

can be proved possible. The correctness of that view we may here assume, as the entire first volume was spent in establishing it. According to it miracles must necessarily be possible, because God's will and almighty power are infinite, and because, without contradicting Himself, he can, in his infinite wisdom, employ the creatures he has made for higher ends and purposes. Belief in miracles is common to all religions,[29] since it is the immediate outcome of belief in God's infinite power and wisdom.

The objections urged against miracles from the theistic stand point are easily refuted. They are partly material, partly formal. These latter have reference to the descriptive accounts of the miracles, which, it is contended, owing to the cast of thought peculiar to Orientals, must either be resolved into myths or distilled into allegories. The material objections trace the origin of miracles to defective natural knowledge, or subjective fancies, or teleological notions, or psychological influences brought to bear on the mind.[30] The formal objections need not delay us now, as they will have to be dealt with in the enquiry into the critical exegesis of Scripture. The material objections may be reduced to two: Firstly, miracles imply that creation was imperfect and defective. Secondly, God's interference would imperil all science. The first objection proves too much, for it strikes at the root of God's conservation and government of the universe; but this, being the continuance of the work of the same first cause, must be admitted by all who accept the doctrine of creation. Beings, without a sufficient reason in themselves, can only continue to exist by means of that being by whom they were created. This is nothing more than the imperfection inherent in every creature, which is unavoidable, and in no way militates against the perfection of creation.

Some theologians, whose orthodoxy is unsullied by suspicion, connect miracles with the idea of restoration, underlying the

29 See Gloatz, *Ueber das Verhältniss von Wunder und Naturgesetze* in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1886, p. 406.

30 See Denzinger, II., pp. 235, 346.

divine plan of redemption. "To restore nature,"[31] they think, is the purpose of the biblical miracles. For the natural law is the law of nature, as at present constituted. Now, since God is the Creator and continuous cause of nature, he can loose the bonds by which nature is chained down, and set aside the limitations which prevent her from roaming at large, especially as these bonds and limitations are neither normal, nor originally intended; he can create nature anew, and raise it to a higher sphere; whence it follows that the laws of nature, by being changed, are made higher. This view of nature, however, is based on a false appreciation of man's original state, and of sin as a corruption of man's physical nature. Nor, again, was the *curse of nature* so realistic. Otherwise God would have to be working miracles continuously, and all mysteries in the physical world would have to be banished. Jesus did not work miraculous cures to "restore nature." Did he, perchance, heal all the sick in Palestine? Did not the Galileans continue to die as before? Nevertheless miracles have a purpose, and a providential purpose. Far from obstructing the course of God's providence, they eminently further its aims. As God's providence aims at guiding the ordinary course of nature to a higher end, namely the last end of man, so, in special cases, this result will be achieved with greater certainty, by breaking through that ordinary course. By this remark the common objection from God's unchangeableness is also dashed to the ground. For miracles, like creation, have a place in the eternal ideas, and form a part of one and the same providential scheme To deny that this is possible is to deny the living God, the Creator, and Providence of the world. Rousseau was right in saying that to ask whether God can work miracles is both absurd and godless.

More plausible is the other objection which exclaims that

31 Rosenkranz, Langen, Martensen, Ebrard, Beck, and others. See Lindenmeyer, *Geschichte Jesu*, 1875, pp. 62, 72. Denzinger II p. 393. Hettinger, *Apologie*, I. 2 p 256.

the law of causality is in danger and natural knowledge in jeopardy. Miracles, we would observe, are exceptions. Now exceptions do not destroy the rule. Hence, miracles, being exceptions, cannot shake the constancy of nature's laws, if those laws which are but mental abstractions ought to be called constant. So the study of nature is not thwarted by miracles. Furthermore, we would observe that these exceptions do not cross the ordinary beaten track of the student, but are entirely restricted to the domain of religion. Therefore it is silly to object, if God interfered by strewing miracles in our path, that the whole universe would be thrown into confusion. In any given case the student of nature is bound either to hazard a natural explanation, or to suspend his judgment. In this last case, the question of a miracle being impossible is ruled out of court. God's natural relation to the world renders it possible. As God, of his free will and not from necessity, created, perfected and guided the world, according to a wise plan, to a good end, so, in his wisdom, he has endowed nature with a potentiality for combining and directing its forces, when and as he wills, to the attainment of an end higher than that warranted by its natural propensities.[33] For the purpose of a miracle is not to destroy nor correct the laws of nature, but to guide them to a nobler destiny, by breaking through the ordinary chain of causation. We fully allow that a "lawless violation of "nature's order" is not necessary to save belief in a living and free God; but, at the same time, nature should be "credited with elasticity," and considered "in need and liable to interposition from above."[34] If this be denied, then the ground is cut from under any explanation of even natural events, whose coincidence has in it aught of the inexplicable and wonderful, though the several forces and laws act uniformly and necessarily. Thus writes Lotze: "The immediate aim of a force that acts "miraculously . . . is not to destroy the validity of

33 S. Thom., *de mirac.*, a. 1 ad 6. Denzinger, II. p. 347.
34 Pfleiderer, *Religionsphilosophie*, II. p. 435. Teichmüller, p. 173.

"the law. But, while it changes the internal condition of "things by virtue of its intimate relation to them, it mediately "changes the ordinary effect or result of the law, though "leaving its validity untouched, and really using it for its "own ends. Mechanical necessity is a preserve in which "miracles do not nor should poach; but things subject to and "governed by the laws of mechanical necessity, do not, in their "inner nature, depend upon those laws, but rather on the "purpose of the world. Here is the opening for a power, "commanding in the name of purpose, to introduce and exert "its influence. If, at this word of command, a change is "effected in the internal condition of the elements, and in the "degrees of their attraction or repulsion, the result will surely "follow, not because the laws of mechanical necessity have "fallen into abeyance, but because they are held in a firmer "grip."[35]

Analogy comes to our aid to enable us to illustrate how God can interfere in nature without detriment to nature's laws. Natural laws are modified by one another and by human agency. In tides, the earth's attraction is modified by the attraction of sun and moon.[36] The magnet overcomes, in part, the force of gravitation. The expansiveness of water, in the form of ice, splits rocks asunder. Heat relaxes the cohesion of molecules. The force of attraction, combined with tangential velocity, compels bodies to rotate. By natural influences bodies can be so changed that their properties seem reversed. Iron, as is well known, when raised to a very great heat loses its magnetic force; nay, it can be heated to such a degree as not to injure bodies that come in contact with it. The same thing is found in extreme degrees of cold. Some bodies (e.g. sulphur), crystallize at different temperatures according to different systems of crystallization. The organic force in plants gives to the chemical forces a new tendency, and makes the elements com-

35 II. 54.
36 *C. gent.*, III. p. 99; I. Q. cv. a. 5 ad 1. Denzinger, II. p. 348.

bine in a wonderful variety of ways. Still more conspicious is the sway that natural forces exert over the animal world. Food is subjected to an organic process, and the several organs are forced to work harmoniously together. Moreover, the whole organism is, in many ways, master of all its environment. Is it strange that the heavy mass of the bird should rise into the air? or that fish should swim in the water, and by a skilful use of their organs determine both the height and direction of their movements? Every moment the *vis inertiae* can be overcome, and the organs of motion can even be employed in an unnatural manner.

Then, again, how widespread is man's dominion over the forces of nature! Water is made to drive his mills and machines, and in the form of steam it causes the most complex movements. He compels carbon to yield gas, that he may light up streets and houses. Electricity not only throws gas in the shade, but also, which is most wonderful, serves to transmit thoughts with lightning speed from one end of the world to the other. The sciences of electricity, chemistry, and thermo-dynamics, rest, in their entirety, on man's dominion over the forces of nature, and his power to direct them to higher ends. A factory and the simplest machine in it reveals how many capricious changes are necessary and possible in the direction of the forces of nature, for the furtherance of man's schemes. It would be interesting to examine just one building under this point of view. From the foundation stone to the last slate on the roof, it discloses a capricious though systematic utilization of nature Even the organic world must bow to man's lordship and pay tribute. The gardener and cattle-breeder are well acquainted with the organic laws that bring about a variety of form and structure, that makes us gape with wonder and astonishment, although we cannot admit with the evolutionist an infinite differentiation. Every day millions of men are counteracting or subduing nature by art, and yet there is no substantial destruction of nature. The elements remain the same. The proportion of the elements in

the atmosphere is undisturbed. Temperature is altered by changes in the earth's surface. Moisture can be increased or diminished. But all these mighty changes are powerless to affect nature, which remains ever the same.

Shall God alone, then, be unable to interfere with this complex machinery of forces, without jeopardising the order of nature? Is it credible that the Creator alone, in His wisdom and power, cannot turn the forces of nature to any but their ordinary purpose? Modifications meet us at every turn; is the Creator alone powerless to effect them? There is, indeed, a vast distinction, and we have no wish to conceal it, between man's power over nature, and the power of working miracles. Man can always point out the natural threads from which his artistic web is woven, but he can never lay bare the ultimate reason of a miracle. There always remains a supernatural residue. To hide this from sight would be to destroy miracles root and branch. It is sufficient to have shown that this miraculous something is compatible both with the idea of God the Creator and with the laws of nature; and that there is nothing, physically or morally, on the part of God or man that stands in the way of the cause or effect. On the part of God miracles are physically possible, because as Creator he is the Lord of nature; and also on the part of nature, because all its forces are conditioned and depend on a higher order, and because its laws have certain limits. Miracles are morally possible on the part of God, for he does not change in nature or person, but only carries out in a perfect manner what is necessary for realizing his eternal plan. On the part of man they are morally possible, because his free will is not forced but merely directed to its true end. Rather God lights up a path that leads to faith and salvation.

In this sense miracles may be said to be necessary as long as man exists. In every religion, even the highest, miracles are indispensable. Revelation is a second and nobler

creation, a new spiritual world which enlightens and elevates this lower world. Even what is passing in everyday life obliges us to look to a higher law of causation. If chance must be scouted as an unscientific principle of explanation, and if, moreover, experience and observation show that actions and events are not absolutely necessary, the only reasonable course is to admit an absolute cause both of the apparently necessary and the apparently accidental. If the laws of nature, and the circumstances under which they act, and actual causation are bare facts, and consequently contingent, how can the necessity of their mechanical connection be other than contingent? Miracles, therefore, cannot be impugned on this score. So far as they are events in nature they, too, form an integral part of the order of nature;[37] while, in so far as they are supernatural, their necessity arises from the religious and moral order of the world. Thus, in their former capacity, they are part of God's ordinary providence, and in the latter they belong to His special and extraordinary providence for man's salvation.

There still remains, as scientists allow, a vast region unexplored, a dark continent in which the ultimate reasons of things must ever be entombed. The louder the confessions of ignorance on the part of science, and the greater its inability to fix supreme laws, and to probe things to their inmost nature, the greater the confidence with which faith can assert that miracles are possible, by pointing out how nature, history and life bristle with miracles. S. Augustine's illustrations on this head, advanced, indeed, with diffidence, were not happy, being all either fabulous or mere natural phenomena. But he hits out straight from the shoulder when he says that naturalists, when twitted by believers with the marvels in nature, could only reply: This is the nature of bodies. And he proceeds thus: "In point of fact this answer is sufficient. Since, "however, God is the author of all natures, why will they not

37 Teichmüller, p. 196.

"accept from us a better reason for refusing to believe, than "the plea of impossibility? To their demand for a reason, we "reply: This is the will of Almighty God."[38] To rebut the charge that we are ignorant of essences and causes (e.g., gravitation and magnetism), Kant strongly insists that our knowledge of nature's laws, and of the limitations and conditions on which they work, is sufficient. But, as we have already shewn, of many of these causes we are and ever shall be sublimely ignorant. Even in nature there are concealed wells, from which man cannot draw water by the ordinary channel of causality, without the aid of the *causa prima*. Natural laws are but abstractions of natural events, and are consequently purely formal in character. Laws, that seemed proved to demonstration, have been stopped in mid career, at a crucial point, beyond which all is dark and uncertain. Laws of nature, whose general truth is considered self-evident, have exceptions, which cease to be surprising because they are familiar. There is one important exception—water—to the law that bodies expand with increased heat and contract with cold. At a certain point Mariotte's law of atmospheric pressure breaks down. Even when we bring to the study of nature all the apparatus of modern science, we stumble, at every turn, on enigmas and marvels. Wonder expresses the philosophic temper to-day, as accurately as in the days of Plato and Aristotle. It is still the beginning of wisdom, "and, we may "safely add, it will be the end." The real world teems with mysteries which man cannot fathom, and which only a block-head, whose principles are much too shallow to sound the bottom of the after-times, "can swallow without straining at: "e.g., the inertia of bodies and their marvellous *actio in distans*, "the *qualitates occultæ* of the chemist, the processes of animal "generation, the power of sight in the optic nerve, self-"consciousness, the inexplicable relations of matter and spirit. "Are not these mysteries?"[39] Why then should we gib and

38 *De civ. Dei*, xxi. 7, 1. Denzinger, II. p. 399. Kant, *Relig.*, p. 184.

39 Liebmann, *Analysis*, p. 626.

shy, and take fright at miracles in religion? If unsolved and insoluble mysteries are so rife in common-place metaphysics, miracles cannot be impossible because they are supernatural, and beyond the compass of natural reason.

But, if miracles overleap nature's bounds, how can they be recognised as such? At this point the opponents of miracles face round, and make a bold stand. Miracles, so Spinoza, Hume, Hobbes, and others proclaim, are a symbol of ignorance.[40] Nature's mysteries, on which we have just been insisting, while favouring the view that miracles are possible, seem to create a doubt as to the possibility of knowing what is and what is not a miracle. Before we can recognize a miracle, they say, we must have an exact knowledge of all nature's laws and forces, and be able to form an accurate estimate of God's immediate action. To comply with this last condition a special revelation is needed; and even were it to hand it might be nonsuited by the plea of deception. But this condition is not strictly necessary to enable us to recognize a miracle, as it is already implied in the first. For an effect that baffles all the forces of nature must be produced by the highest cause. The one thing necessary is to show, not merely that the cause is unknown, but also that it cannot have been a natural cause. Hence an analysis of the idea and nature of God, in order to gather therefrom God's mode and manner of action, is superfluous. It is enough to arrive, by the synthetic method, and on the strength of the principle of causality, at the conclusion that the phenomenon could have no possible cause but God. And here we may fittingly appeal to the proofs we have given for the existence of God. We there shewed that creation, from first to last, can only be accounted for by an absolute, free and self-conscious spirit, who is above nature, and whose actions, consequently, must pass over nature's frontier into the domain of spirit. This view of a miracle as a transaction between spirit and spirit, may furnish another note by which miracles may be

40 See Denzinger, II. p. 338. Strauss, *Christliche Glaubenslehre*. I. p. [illegible]

known. We must, however, be on our guard against supposing that the recognition of a miracle rests on the construction that any individual puts on the phenomenon. For this would be to abandon miracles to the mercy of private judgment, and to relegate them to the domain of subjectivity. Of course belief in a miracle, like all faith, supposes the soul to stand in some relation to God, and to be moved by divine grace. A soul, under such influence, might easily see the mysterious guiding hand of God in almost every event. But since miracles are for unbelievers, not for believers, there must be some objective mark by which they can be known.

For this reason, the importance of the first condition for recognizing a miracle cannot be exaggerated. But is there one whose heart does not sink within him when the condition is first set before him? Or who can hope to fulfil it even half way? Surely the scientist who would dare to say that he knows all nature's forces and laws is still unborn. Is there one who can boast of understanding perfectly all the laws hitherto discovered? Our knowledge, it is truly said, is piecemeal, and piecemeal it will remain to the last. Compared with our ignorance, our knowledge of nature dwindles into insignificance. This has been made clearer than ever by the modern division of labour and the formation of special sciences. Mineralogy, zoology, botany, physiology, pathology, surgery travel each in its own well-defined path. How then, it will be asked, can we presume to brand any extraordinary event as a miracle?

This difficulty is greatly enhanced by a glance into the past. Science boasts, not without reason, of having made immense progress. How swift were the ancients to label everything outside their limited knowledge of nature, as a miracle! Augustine, as we have already seen, dragged heaps of fabulous stories and extraordinary natural phenomena into his proof of miracles. How minutely he describes e.g. the well-known event of the slaking of lime! Cold water makes the burnt lime bubble and boil. What, he asks, could be more wonderful? And yet a

greater wonder was in store. For oil, which is more combustible, when thrown into the lime, produces no heat. "Now if this "marvel had been told us of some Indian mineral, which we "had no opportunity of experimenting upon, we should either "have forthwith pronounced it a falsehood, or certainly should "have been greatly astonished. But things that daily present "themselves to our own observation we despise, not because "they are really less marvellous, but because they are common; "so that even some products of India itself, remote as it is from "ourselves, cease to excite our admiration as soon as we "can admire them at our leisure."[42] And yet how simple is the modern explanation of the phenomenon! The lime uniting with water becomes hydrate of calcium, and by reason of the great affinity of the chemicals, develops considerable heat.

Now the miracles of faith belong, for the most part, to the early days of religion and history. Were the forces and laws of nature present to the minds of the chroniclers? They hardly gave them a thought. Belief in miracles was universal. Jesus, so Origen thinks, was specially sent to the Jews, because they, being familiar with miracles, would, by comparison, be in a position to recognize him by them.[43] But the heathen were as fully disposed to believe in miracles. The Jews were, in a certain sense, at a comparative disadvantage, because the great miracles done among them had led them to expect still greater from the Messias.[44] No one dreamed of doubting that miracles were possible and recognizable. Legal or scientific proof, even had it been to hand, was deemed unnecessary. The doubts which Scripture records as having been raised about miracles affect not the possibility of recognizing them, but the fact, as in the cure of the man born blind.

42 *De civ. Dei*, xxi. 4, 2. Translated by Marcus Dodds, M.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1871. See also the following passages on the diamond and the loadstone.

43 *C. Cels.*, II. p. 57.

44 See Lipsius, *Apokryphe Apostelgeschichten*, II. pp. 1. 346.

May we, then, set down miracle-narratives as due to a defective knowledge of nature's forces? Or were the historians solely bent on promoting the religious ends they had in view? Is a witness, not acquainted with the whole range of medicine, disqualified from giving evidence of the raising of a dead man to life? The narrower the province in which the specialist labours, the greater is the confidence in the results achieved by his science. Why, then, should not the same measure be meted out to miracles? Why demand in their case what is impossible, namely, an absolute knowledge of all nature's forces? The demand is preposterous, and the height of unreason. Here, as elsewhere, a knowledge of the natural forces and laws that come within the special department in which the miracle is enacted must suffice. But, even here, it is not necessary to gauge the limits of the law exactly, but only to define them negatively, that is, to show that the miracle cannot *conceivably* be explained within such limits. Only a very slight knowledge of optics is requisite to be able to assert that a man born blind cannot be healed. Nor, again, need one be an experienced physician to maintain that it is impossible for a dead man to raise himself to life again. The fact that Gräfe has operated successfully on several men born blind, will not be advanced in argument to show that Jesus anticipated the science of Gräfe. To say that the resurrection of the dead ceases to be miraculous, because it is possible to conceive it as connected in some way with the natur l order, will not help us; for modern science has so little faith in such a natural connection, that it scouts belief in the resurrection of the dead as absurd. Such explanations have no weight with scientific men; they merely pile difficulty on difficulty, and are fraught with mischief to the faithful. Theologians, therefore, would do well to eschew them. But it so happens that, in this particular case, the historians took great pains to render the fact proof against all attacks from the side of medicine. Long ago S. Augustine pointed out a gradation in the miracles of raising the dead.

The daughter of Jairus had but just died; the young man of Naim was being borne to the grave; Lazarus was already four days in the tomb and was putrefying. The resurrection of Jesus will be dealt with later.[45]

The effect, it is generally allowed, must be proportioned to the cause, the means to the end. Nothing produces nothing. In the spiritual world, however, but in it alone, small causes may effect great things. Homœopathy, with its minute doses and big results, proves nothing to the contrary. For certain chemical substances are capable of almost indefinite attenuation, without loss of power. Nevertheless it is true that the smaller the dose, the smaller the effect. Homœopathy does not profess to effect instantaneous cures. But its main principle, viz., of banishing poison with poison, which is founded on the further principle "*simile sibi simile agit*," affords a new proof for our thesis. For it is precisely this principle which does not hold good in miracles. Thus if Jesus, by his mere word, effects a cure at a distance, he has undoubtedly passed beyond the boundary-line of natural force. Clay cannot possibly be a natural remedy for giving sight to the blind. Jesus healed some by laying his hand on them; others were healed by touching the hem of his garment. Surely these cures, which were sudden, and which the sick themselves, as well as the the bystanders, at once put to the test, can not be set down as recognized methods of healing. And what could have been the supposed mysterious contact between the unfortunate cripple, longing for God's help, and the wonder-worker, filled with faith and confidence in God, that can possibly explain these cures? Jesus, indeed, said repeatedly: "Thy faith "hath made thee whole," and he held up faith as working the miracle; not, however, as the efficient cause, but only as an indispensable moral condition. Elsewhere Jesus emphatically said: "I say to thee, arise, take up thy bed, and "walk." The Fathers had lovingly compared the miraculous

45 Hase. *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 204.

multiplication of the loaves with the natural growth of wheat, long before Paulus had thought of explaining this miracle by an accelerated process of nature. But these wonders of nature do not come within a measurable distance of the feeding of 5,000 men with five loaves. Neither can the walking on the waters, nor the stilling of the tempest at sea be set down to any natural cause. They are shewn to be miracles by the disproportion between the means and the effect, and by the instantaneous appearance of effects wholly different in kind from those warranted by the means. Very little knowledge of nature is needed to assure us that these phenomena were not due to any purely natural causes. We are dealing with a question of principle rather than of the details of natural science, when we define its limits. Science necessarily supposes that natural effects follow regularly, and are proportioned to their cause.

Miracles may be known by yet another test. The miracle-worker himself must know best whether he works by his own natural power, or with power from on high, or whether he is indulging in Oriental hyperboles. Now, even if we suppose that the spectators might be deceived by extraordinary phenomena, and that religious minded people are quicker to accept miracles than sceptical rationalists, yet such considerations (which, by the way, are questions of degree rather than of principle) are quite beside the mark, if applied to men who worked miracles, with full consciousness of miraculous power. Moses and the prophets ascribed their miracles to the power of God. They showed their credentials as God's ambassadors. Jesus admits but one of two explanations in casting out devils: either in the name of the devil, or in the name of God. Before raising Lazarus to life he prayed to his Father, and thanked Him for hearing him. When he sent forth the apostles, he gave them power to cast out unclean spirits and to heal the sick. They worked miracles in his name. Are all these possessors of miraculous power to be accounted as enthusiasts, who mistook natural effects for miracles,

and ascribed to God what they accomplished by their own power and skill? Is it credible that the apostles would have persevered unto death in believing in the miracles of Jesus, had not their conviction, that the miracles were real, been firm as a rock? Or could they, amid the severest trials and persecutions, have been cajoled into holding fast to the belief that it was the power of God that worked through their words and works?

Or does the fault lie with the historians, who have recorded extraordinary events as miracles? or, again, with the readers who have mistaken parables and allegories for literal truths? An eye-witness can testify only to the outward event, not to the supernatural cause. But the miracles worked by Moses and the prophets are recorded by themselves. Two of the Evangelists were Apostles. From Jesus' own lips they heard not only that he intended to work miracles, but that he worked them in God's name. They were witnesses of the resurrection, and of the coming down of the Holy Ghost. So, when they wrote the history of the miracles, they had the best possible guarantee of their reality. The very enemies of Jesus are put into the witness-box. If this evidence is not allowed to be decisive, an appeal lies to S. Paul's epistles. Even the most doubt-ridden sceptic must admit the genuineness of the four great epistles of S. Paul, which are abundantly sufficient to prove that the apostle claimed the charismata—the shewing forth of the spirit and power—and recognized similar gifts in the faithful. The I. Epistle to the Corinthians gives an insight afforded by no other writing of the New Testament, into the miraculous workings of the Holy Spirit in the apostolic assemblies. Could S. Paul, who himself worked miracles and appealed to them, have been deceived in his account? Could he, and the first apostles, and Christ himself have built their teaching on quick-sands? To prove a doctrine from a wonder, and the miraculous character of the wonder from the doctrine would be bad logic. But here it is not a question of an isolated case, but of a broad

principle. The same men who preached a new and sublime doctrine to the world, bear witness that they worked miraculous signs in the power of God. And in this they could neither be deceived nor wish to deceive others.[46]

For this reason the Apostles were the best judges of true and false miracles. Holy Scripture relates how marvellously the magicians of Egypt imitated the miracles of Moses. Our Lord says that the Jews will cast out devils,* and that many will do wonders in his name without the right dispositions.† S. John told our Lord: "We saw a certain man casting "out devils in thy name, and we forbade him, because he fol- "loweth not with us. And Jesus said to him: Forbid him not, "for he that is not against you is for you."‡ Nevertheless these extraordinary effects, since they were wrought in the name of God or of Jesus, and could serve at least to honour God and to prove the faith, may be accounted as miracles.[47] But false prophets and false Christs, it is said, shall also deceive the people by their miracles. Of the last days Jesus foretold: "For "there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall "show great signs and wonders, insomuch as to deceive (if "possible) even the elect."§ Are these wonderful things, then, to be explained as sorcery and deception? Neither can the records of miracles in other religions be indiscriminately made to vanish in the mists of mythology. With Fathers and Theologians we must allow that false prophets were able, by the power of the devil, to produce wonderful effects.[48]

Heathen miracles have always been regarded with suspicion.

46 See Denzinger, II. p. 354.

47 S. Thom., I. Q. cx. a. 4 ad 2; II. II. Q. clxxviii. a. 2; III. Q. xliii. a. 7 et 4.

48 See Math. xii. 25; I. Cor., viii. 5-10, 20; II. Thess., II. 9. Clement, *Recogn.*, II. p. 32; Aug., *de civ. Dei*, xxi. 6. Denzinger, II. p. 354. Hettinger, *Apologetik*, I. p. 220.

* Matt. xii, 27.

† Ibid. vii, 22.

‡ Luke ix, 49.

§ Matth. xxiv, 24. See Jeremias. xxiii, 32.

Origen vehemently protests against them being mentioned in the same breath with the miracles of Christ. For they who, by jugglery and trickery, tried to make themselves appear like Jesus, have withered like the grass of the field. Such, he says, were Simon Magus and Dositheus; and Simonians and Dositheans like Judas the Galilean and Theudas, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, have vanished like smoke. Christians do not, like magicians and soothsayers, cast out devils by magical incantations, but by prayer and adjuration. Augustine, on the other hand, exposes the untrustworthiness of the narratives, and lays bare the evident fraud and deception. Thus, for instance, he tells how, by means of a concealed magnet, the Egyptian priests set an idol in motion, and made it swing in mid-air. And yet there is still something left that requires explanation. It has been said, indeed, that such signs are of slight value, because they affected not the whole of nature, *but merely one or other province.*[50] This distinction, however, though necessary in theory, it somewhat artificial, and certainly difficult of application.

But moral, as well as physical, conditions must be taken into account. Satan, it is true, can disguise himself as an angel of light, and the gift of working miracles may be, in itself, independent of moral character; still this last is not, as a rule, a matter of indifference. Our Lord's word here holds good: "By their "fruits you shall know them." God cannot permit error to triumph for long, or man to be tempted above his strength. Jesus has foretold the coming of Anti-Christ, and thereby warned us not to be credulous. Only the weak succumb to light temptations. Jesus himself has given one sign that never fails. He who works miracles in the name of Jesus, cannot at the same time speak ill of him. In like manner Moses declared that a false miracle is always known by its leading to idolatry. Anyhow, nothing at any time that leads away from God or Jesus Christ, can be a true miracle.[51] For nowadays there can

50 S. Thom., I. Q. cxiv. a. 4.
51 Pascal, xxvii. 3.

be no reasonable doubt that Christianity is the true religion. No miracle is genuine if the worker excludes Christ from his religion. Side by side with the false, the true miracle will always appear the greater, for truth must always prevail. Of this the teaching and history of Christianity furnish irrefragable proof, and no impartial student will doubt it, even if his estimate is but relative. The history and propagation of other important religions stand to Christianity in the same relation as false miracles to true, and help to confirm its supremacy. For, by comparison, the miracles of Christianity alone stand out as worthy of God, and calculated to promote his honour and glory.

This remark also applies to the so-called miracles of Spiritualism, and the striking phenomena of Hypnotism, Magnetism and Somnambulism.[52] The wonders of Spiritualism are theatrical effects which may, perhaps, gratify human curiosity; but both in origin and aim they are utterly devoid of religious significance. A thousand distinguishing marks will not avail the man who identifies these with the miracles of the bible, and who sees no difference between Christian hope and the vapid nugatory teaching of spiritualists about the next world. The sickly (hysteric and epileptic) conditions that give rise to so-called pathological phenomena, have nothing in common with miracles. They are wholly inadequate to explain in detail the miracles of the bible. The history, doctrine and morality of Christianity are too great to be drawn by such hairs. Here we may say with truth: the doctrine sets a seal on the miracles, and the miracles on the doctrine.[53] It is as hopeless to try and disconnect the pure doctrine of Christianity from miracles, and to purge religion of them, as to represent the personality of Christ as purely human, and yet to hold fast to his divine origin. The miracle of Christianity is so intimately bound up with the person,

52 Conf., *Science catholique*, 1886, I. II. and 1887, ix.

53 Pascal, xxvii. 1. Girodon, I. p. 40.

doctrine and legislation of Jesus that no sort of concession to rationalism will profit anything. The conditions of a miracle may be maximized as well as minimized. Both extremes are alike harmful. Traditionalism, by postulating a deeper conception of historical certainty, almost swamps ideal certitude in historical. Ontologism by setting metaphysical, moral and ideal certitude at the summit, all but abandons historical certitude to the mercy of the wind and waves. Not facts alone, nor ideas and speculations alone, can provide religious and philosophical thought with a safe basis.[54]

The Vatican Council teaches: "If anyone shall say "that miracles are impossible, and therefore that all the "accounts regarding them, even those contained in Holy "Scripture, are to be dismissed as fabulous or mythical; "or that miracles can never be known with certainty, and "that the divine origin of Christianity cannot be proved "by them: let him be anathema."[55]

54 S. Thom., I. Q. lxxxii. a. i. *c. gent.* I. 7; *de magistro*, a. 1 ad 13.

55 Sess. iii. c. 3. can. 4. On the Protestant side see Steinmayer, *Die Wunderthaten des Herrn*, Berlin, 1884.

CHAPTER XI.

ON PROPHECY.

Cicero makes his brother Quintus discourse thus on prophecy: "As far as my knowledge goes, there is no "people, whether highly cultured and enlightened, or deeply "sunk in barbarism and savagery, who do not believe that "there exist indications and omens of the future, and also men "capable of understanding and explaining them." "Even "among barbarous tribes there exists a power of divination and "prophecy." Modern Ethnography has shown Quintus to be in the right. With the general fact of Religion is bound up a general belief in the possibility of foretelling the future, less by art and the calculating of probabilities, than by "a spontaneous "movement of the soul which is independent of the will." "Such men are brought into close relations with God, of whose "nature . . . our souls are, as it were, stray drops and "emanations," and they can prophesy because "the human "soul is brought in contact with the divine spirit that pervades "all things." In this passage Quintus' thoughts were mostly running on oracles, in which the answers were supposed to be given by divine inspiration. In our own days a parallel is furnished by the devices of the schamans and magicians, who kindle a fire of artificial religious enthusiasm, with a view to receiving divine revelation. But these phenomena only go

to show that the human heart is everywhere actuated by similar tendencies, which abuse has defaced almost past recognition. Sophocles firmly believed that oracles were an expression of the will of the gods; but, in his time, the Greeks had long lost faith in them. Cicero was an unbeliever in prophecy, and he has bequeathed to posterity a spicy sarcasm anent the haruspices. Prophecy is likened by Plutarch to an unmarked, unreasoning tablet, which, being open to receive any sensible impressions or presentiments, unconsciously grasps the future, especially when it is projected on the background of the present. This happens whenever the body is changed by being subjected to a state of *ἐνθουσιασμός* (inspiration?)

Above this general belief the prophets of the Old Testament tower like mountain cedars over the straggling underwood. Schools, in which disciples were professedly trained in the prophetic office, had existed since the days of Samuel. Others, at God's beck and call, left house, and flocks and field, to become prophets. Etymologically a prophet is one who speaks; but with Greeks, from the times of Æschylus, Herodotus, and Pindar, used it to denote one who interpreted the oracular utterances of the gods (soothsayers), or declared hidden things. In the Septuagint it is the translation of the Hebrew *Nabi* (*nabâ*=to press oneself forward,[1] to proclaim something) i.e. one who proclaims the revelation and will of God.* The older name *seer* (*Roeh* †), to which the later *Choseh* corresponds,‡ points to the fact that the thing declared was seen in a vision, a spiritual vision in God, who initiates the prophet into His mysteries, and reveals to him things that would otherwise be hidden, that he may be a *θεόλογος*, speaking by God, because he sees God and is directed by God.[2] Prophecy, as Philo

1 Cicero, *de divin.*, I. 1, 23. Plutarch, *de defectu orac.* c. 40. See Fritz, p. 129. Denzinger, II. p. 403. Schultze, *Untergang*, p. 305.

2 Haneberg, *Geschichte der Offenb.*, 3 ed. p. 90. Kihn, *Theodor von Mops.*, p. 104.

* Deut. xiii. 2; 3rd Kings xxii. 7.

† I. Kings ix. 9.

‡ I. Chron. xxi. 9.; xxv. 5.

observes, is not limited to a forecaste of the future, but embraces the knowledge of all those sublime and divine things which are hidden from ordinary mortals.[3]

But in both cases, it is clearly essential that a prophet should base his message on a revelation and a commission from God.* God Himself explains the word in this sense. "I have appointed thee the God of Pharaoh" (*i.e.* have furnished thee with the power of God); and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet."† In this respect the patriarchs are called prophets, and Moses himself is a prophet.‡ For when the Lord said to him: "I will raise thee up a prophet out of the midst "of their brethren like to thee; and I will put my words in "his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I shall "command him,"§ he laid down the twofold qualification of a prophet: he must be raised up by God, and be commissioned to say what God has revealed to him.[4] In the New Testament also the word has the same meaning The prophet received from God a gift for the "edification and exhortation and comfort" of the assembly.‖ He goes about to announce the word of God,** and hence he ranks with the Apostles.[5] But the New Testament likewise, recognizes the prophets of the Old Law, and looks upon them as the organs of divine revelation,†† and as men of God, impelled by the spirit of God, who, as the heralds of God to men, declared that they were inspired to speak.‡‡

Both the biblical and the non-biblical idea of prophet contains yet another element, easily deducible from the foregoing, which gradually overshadowed the others. The

3 Gfroerer, *Philo*. I. p. 57. Fritz, p. 131.
4 Denzinger, II. p. 402.
5 Luke xi. 49. I Cor., xii. 28. Ephes. II. 20; III. 5; iv. 11.
* II. Peter, I. 20.
† Exod vii. 1. Cf. Jerem xv. 19.
‡ Gen. xx. 7. Ps. 105, 15.
§ Deut, xviii. 18.
‖ I. Cor. xiv. 3; Acts xiii. 1; xv. 32.
** Matt. x. 41; xxiii. 34.
†† Hebr. I. 1.
‡‡ II. Peter 1. 21.

prophets of the Old Law were inspired by God, not only to revive faith and to enforce morality, but also to threaten by pointing to the chastisements that were overhanging the people, and would, in the future, burst upon them; that is, they foretold the future, they prophesied in the strict sense of the word. They painted, often in vivid colours, the evils and misery that would befall the people, if they foolishly paid no heed to the warning; and, because of the intimate union between politics and religion, the threats generally had reference to war, famine or pestilence. But, as a rule, the prophets lit up the dark and dismal future with the hope that God would show mercy on their repentance.

One prophecy, however, struck the key-note of all prophecy,—the Messianic prophecy. To it, amid shipwrecking storms and direful thunders, the Israelites anchored in security their hopes. It invested the prophetic office of the Old Testament with a character which made it of the greatest moment in the New. The prophets foretold the Messias, and the full meridian of his glory. In this light the New Testament views them as prophets. For with the New Testament, prophecies were fulfilled,[6] and the race of prophets died out. Prophecies, indeed, there have been since, but only in regard to particular events.* In a measure, our Lord and the Apostles, but none others, can compare with the prophets of the Old Law; for Jesus foretold the history of the Messianic kingdom, and how its glory, like a circle in the water, should ever enlarge itself. S. John uttered a special prophecy,† and S. Paul has drawn in wonderful historical perspective the fate that awaited unbelieving Israel.‡ To this narrower meaning of the word, its usage among the heathen to some extent corresponds. For heathen

6 Math. II. 5; xxii. 41. Luke xxiv. 25–27. John xii. 40; viii. 56. Acts II. 25 seq.; viii. 28 seq.; xvii. 11. II. Peter I. 19. See Denzinger, II. p. 407.

* Acts xi. 28; xxi. 10.

† Apoc. I. 3.

‡ Rom. xi. 25 seq.

seers, as foretelling the future, passed for prophets,.[7] Even the interpretation of oracles required the skill of discerning the future. All who divined from the flight of birds and the entrails of beasts good and bad omens, were, in the heathen sense, prophets. The heathen are again at one with revelation in looking upon prophecy as a gift of God. All truth comes from God, error from man. He who proclaims truth with certainty and authority must be inspired by God. This refers in a very special manner to foretelling future events. God alone knows the future. To predict the future is not an easy task. In forecasting even natural events we are simply groping in the dark. It is no mean feat to calculate in advance solar and lunar eclipses, and all the movements of the heavenly bodies. It is an equally great achievement to be able to determine by nature's laws what will or will not happen under certain conditions. But how unsafe, even in these limits, is it to prophecy! The whole science of meteorology is still in its infancy. But what about history? Who would cherish the hope of ever succeeding in foretelling its course? He, then, who, with clear certainty, can fortell distant future events, which have no adequate cause in the present, must have derived his wisdom from Him who searcheth man's reins and heart, and guides his destiny, and to whom past and future are equally present. "For to predict future events "exceeds human capacity, and is a mark of divinity, and "such prophecy shows by its fulfilment, that it was uttered by the "Spirit of God.[8] God and prophecy are correlatives. Where prophecy is, there gods must be: Where there are gods, there must also be prophecy.[9] Certain prophecy is found only with the true God. Idols, by their inability to foretell the future, proclaimed their own imposture.* In prophecy, the Jews beheld as in a mirror, the majesty of their God. "For I am God, and there is

7 Plato, *Charm.*, p. 173 c. Herodotus, viii. 36, 37, 135; ix. 34, and other places
8 Origen, *c. Cels.*, vi 10. See Denzinger, II. p. 421.
9 Cicero, *de divin.*,
* Isaias xli. 23.

"no god beside, neither is there the like to me: Who shew "from the beginning the things that shall be at last, and "from ancient times the things that are as yet not done."* "The heart is perverse above all things, and unsearchable, "who can know it? I am the Lord who search the heart "and prove the reins."†

The internal act by which supernatural revelation is conveyed to the prophets is called, in the wider sense, inspiration. The prophets are inspired by God. Of this inspiration a more detailed account was given above in treating of the theory of revelation; here we are specially concerned with the Messianic prophecies, which must be recorded as an essential part of the divine revelations that prepared the way for Christianity. These prophecies are set down in writing, and can be audited by those who come after. There cannot be a better proof of the truth of a man's words than the fulfilment of a definite prophecy accompanying them. Nevertheless this test of prophecy is not so simple as at first blush it appears. With the ancients oracles were proverbial for their ambiguity, and left the questioner as wise as before. The sayings, as Cicero remarks, were so cleverly contrived, that they might be construed as foretelling any turn that events might take.[10] From such counterfeits it is easy to distinguish true prophecies, at any rate the Messianic prophecies, all of which directed their gaze on *one* definite object. Still, even here, some difficulties are strewn in our path. In the first place, time did not enter into the calculations of the prophets. The future, whether near or remote, is thrown on the screen of the immediate present. Thus the prophecies were made vivid and realistic before they were fulfilled.

In the next place, biblical prophecies contained many obscurities of form and matter which only the fulfilment could make

10 L.c. II. 54.

* Isaias xlvi. 9.

† Jeremias xvii. 9, 10.

luminous. But this, again, is a peculiarity founded on the purpose of prophecy, which cannot produce a moral effect on all alike, unless it be veiled in symbolical language. But as the prophets had dealings with both present and future, their utterances, when God so willed, if designed to produce an immediate improvement in their hearers, were delivered in language transparently clear. But truths that had a deep hidden sense they wrapped up in enigmas, allegories, obscure sayings, parables or proverbs, which the common people could not understand, in order, as Origen thinks, that those who were willing and not afraid to surmount difficulties for the sake of virtue and truth, might, by dint of enquiry, find out the meaning and turn it to profit. S. Chrysostom delivered two homilies on the obscurity of prophecies. In one he says: "Prophetic utterances are like riddles. The Old Testa- "ment is very difficult, and its books are hard to understand; "but the New is clearer and easier."[11] "Only those things "were foreshadowed, of which we were to see the fulfilment "in Christ." But we may add, even these are often difficult to understand. For example the Jews, mistaking the shell of the prophecies for the kernel, failed to recognize the lowly Messias under the kingly raiment, and God's kingdom beneath the glow and glitter of the ideal formed from Solomon's kingdom. At first, at all events, Christ's disciples were not much in advance of the Jews. Not until the prophecies about Christ had been fulfilled, and our Lord Himself had opened to them the sense of the Scripture, had they any insight into the prophecies concerning him. With this fact before us, we are almost tempted to think that biblical and heathen prophecies are in this respect analogous; for with what consummate skill could the tragedians explain ambiguous oracles in the light of after events!

But, after all, the analogy cannot hold for any but isolated prophecies. Applied to the prophecies of the Old Testament,

11 Chrysost. Migne P. gr. Tom. lvi. pp. 167, 172. Origen, c. *Cels*., vii. p. 10.

which form a connected chain and coherent system, the analogy completely breaks down. The agreement of so many prophets in the essential points of prophecy, the organism of prophecy from that of the Protevangelium to that of the last judgment, the dovetailing of the prophecies into the entire history of the people, give them a force of proof that is quite irresistible. At times, indeed, the construction put upon one or the other prophecy was at variance with the original meaning, either because, being interwoven with the history of the time, it had a double sense, or because its substance was hidden beneath the figurative and historical drapery. For we know in part and we prophesy in part.* It would be contrary, indeed, to the prophetic spirit to regard prophecies as mere applications of the general threats and promises of God. But, on the other hand, Lessing is too exacting when he requires that a genuine prophecy shall be "not merely fulfilled, "but fulfilled in the specified sense and on the specified grounds "in which and on which it was uttered,"[12] because the single prophecies are links in a chain. Lessing supposes that "what "the enthusiast unintentionally predicted, chance can uninten-"tionally fulfil;" this might perhaps happen in a few cases, but cannot happen in many or in all. The Messianic groundwork of all the prophecies is unmistakable. It is not merely an universal, abstract thought of undefined expectations, but it points to one person, and becomes more vivid and more defined as the time of fulfilment draws near. Prophecy, though having relations with teleology, is not simply one of its subordinate elements.

The Jews, in their worldly spirit, mistook the political dress, in which the prophecies were attired, for the thing itself. The picture of the Messias, sprung from David's royal race, exercising universal dominion, lulled their senses with delight; but they hardly gave a thought to the spiritual meaning of the picture, although the prophets had fixed that meaning by pointing out the

12 Lessing, *Theol. Schriften*, p. 193. See Kuhn, *Theol. Quart.*, 1838, p. 568. On the whole question, Denzinger, II. pp. 405, 414, 483.

* I. Cor. xiii. 9.

Redeemer as a man of sorrows, sent to ransom mankind from sin and misery. Hence the hopes they built on the Messias were earthly and carnal, and inextricably bound up with the restoration of the kingdom of David and Solomon. In the teeth of the prophecies, committed to their especial keeping, they crucified their Messias instead of hailing him as their king. Were the prophecies therefore barren of deep meaning? Rather the Apostle reproaches the Jews even of his day with veiling their hearts when they read Moses. One characteristic feature, common to the prophecies, the Jews never failed to recognize, viz. that a Messias had been promised from the beginning. This hope gave a colouring to their whole history. Now, if in Jesus were fulfilled not only the prophecies relating to the Messias' descent from David, his birth at Bethlehem, his sufferings and death, but likewise those relating to his miracles and his redemption of mankind from sin and bondage, a man of good-will can hardly doubt the main fact, even though it be difficult to decide whether a given passage is directly or indirectly Messianic, or whether it is to be explained typically or allegorically. Of this, even the present faith of the Jews is witness. For, considering the character of the prophecies and their connection with the Jews in Palestine, all must allow that a fulfilment is now out of the question, and the Jews themselves cannot point to any fulfilment outside Jesus. Unless then they are willing to ape rationalists, and explain the most marked feature of the Old Testament as a big misunderstanding and a huge deception, they must grant that in Jesus, the promised Messias—the hope of all Israel—has appeared. "So clearly was the coming of the Messias pre-"dicted many years beforehand, that the entire Jewish people, "who were hanging on the expectation of Him in whom "they hoped, were split up, after the advent of Jesus, into two "factions. For many confessed Christ and believed that he "was the one promised by the prophets; but others, scorning "the meekness of those who were unwilling to raise a tumult on "account of Jesus' teaching, remained incredulous, and entered

"on the course of crime and violence describ· ' '· · the Apostles."[13] To mark the attitude of the unbelieving . -■ 3, Jesus and the Apostles appealed* to the words of Isaias,† who foretold their unbelief. Even unbelief is constrained to do homage to the truth of the prophecies. "It is wonderful," says Pascal, "how "fondly the Jews doted on things foretold, and how they hated "their fulfilment; and most wonderful withal that this their "propensity should itself have been foretold." "The Jews bore "witness to Jesus, by receiving him, for they were the holders of "the prophecies; but they bore witness to him also by receiving "him not, for in this too they fulfilled the prophecies."

However much the gospel proofs for the fulfilment of prophecy may leave to desiderate, however artificial, in the eyes of modern biblical critics, the proofs spun by the apologist may seem, still, the cumulative proof from the prophecies is so overwhelming, that the uncertainty attaching to some of the details sinks into insignificance. For, after all, what does this uncertainty prove? Merely that prophecy cannot afford to dispense with faith. Prophecies are clear enough for all who wish to believe, and obscure enough to leave room for doubt in men not of good-will. The same is true of the prophecies of our Lord Himself. They were partly figurative, and hence had several meanings, and partly very definite, but, being adverse to the hopes of the disciples, they enlisted no sympathy. Only the fulfilment and the Spirit from above opened the minds of the disciples, and convinced them that the paradox was true.‡ The destruction of Jerusalem was calculated to convince the faithful that the prophecy about the end of the world proceeded from the same divine omniscience. If Jesus, like the prophets of the Old Testament, did not distinctly specify the times, still he repeatedly hinted that the end was not yet. He designedly left

13 Origen, *c. Cels.*, III., p. 28.
* Matth. xiii. 14; John xii. 38; Acts xxviii. 26.
† Isaias LIII. 1; vi. 9.
‡ John ii, 22; xii, 16.

Christians in the dark on this head in order to urge them to be ever on the watch. And this watchfulness and self-sacrifice of Christians in the early ages was greatly stimulated by the belief in the near approach of Christ's second coming (*Parousia*). Are these earnest warnings even now lost on believers? Is not the icy heart often thawed thereby? The variety of views broached concerning the second advent had already in Apostolic times given rise to disquiet and misunderstandings.* S. Peter took occasion to remind the faithful that prophecy was of divine origin,† to put them on their guard against those who derided Christians‡ for hoping in the *Parousia*. But his manner is noteworthy. He takes the opportunity to throw on God's doings the light of history. What God did at the time of the deluge, He can also do now, and whenever He will. In God there is no time, for with him a thousand years are as one day.

Prophecies, being a means and a part of God's Providence, only receive their full significance, when read in the light of the world's history. Against Quintus' doctrine of prophecy, quoted above, Cicero thus argues: "I do not at all allow the reality of prophecy. For nothing can happen but what was predetermined from all eternity to happen at a predestined time; hence chance and prophecy are both ousted."[14] So thought the Stoics, and modern rationalists and naturalists applaud their teaching to the echo. But, when speaking of miracles, we shewed that nature and history are alike inexplicable either by chance or iron necessity. As the universe is unintelligible without an absolute cause, so the history of mankind without divine Providence is a gloomy chaotic mass void of light. But if divine Providence is an important factor in the history of individuals and of humanity, we can steer a middle course between necessity and chance. Even man's free act is subject to God's power, and is the object of His foreknowledge. The prophecy of reve-

14 *De divin.*, II. 3. 7. See Fritz, p. 129.

* I. Thessal. iv, 13.

† II. Pet. i, 14.

‡ Ibid. iii, 2.

lation, proceeding from God's truth and omniscience, is God's wisdom, and serves to guide the world towards the goal of man's salvation. Hence prophecy folds within its embraces the whole economy of salvation. Starting from this sublime, because divine, point of view, Origen could easily retort the gibes of Celsus about the "wise remark,"[15] —it must so have happened because it was foretold. For if the same God guides and foretells our destinies, how can there be a doubt as to the safe issue?

To suppose that these prophetic thoughts merely enshrined the naked fact that a people, whose beginnings were lowly, had been crowned with the laurel wreath of victory, would be a wofully inadequate conception of God's providence over Israel. As if this insignificant people, hated and persecuted of all nations, beyond any other, had not been all along dominated with the certain consciousness that a higher and nobler destiny had been marked out for it. Their whole history, both individually and as a people, is so stamped with this consciousness, that their worship and institutions, events in their history, and individuals amongst them typified the life and person of the Messias. The Passover, the pillar of a cloud in the desert, the water from the rock, the manna in the wilderness, the brazen serpent, are all manifestations of the Logos, or types of the Messias.[16] The sojourn of the people in Egypt is treated as a type of the flight of Jesus thither.* S. Paul found types in Adam, Moses, Isaac and Israel. Even the two sons of Abraham are explained to be emblems of the two Covenants.† The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews represents Christ as the perfect antitype of Melchisedech, and as the great high-priest; and he also explains the sacrifice of the Cross as the fulfilment and completion

15 *C. Cels.*, vii. 2.

16 John vi. 31 seq.; III. 14 seq.; xix. 36. I. Cor. v. 7; x. 1-4. Wisdom xvi. 1 seq.

* Matt. II. 15.

† Galat. iv. 24.

of all the sacrifices of the Old Testament. This, as the Apostle himself remarks, is an allegory.*[17] The several persons and events, while historical realities, are, at the same time, in the hands of Providence, made to serve as types and symbols of things to come.

Here, it is hardly necessary to say, we are treading on slippery ground. To extend the proof from prophecy to every detail would do it harm. Many institutions and ordinances of the Old Testament cannot, indeed, be understood or fully appreciated except in their typical character, and in their bearings on the Messianic Kingdom. This principle is already asserted in part in the Book of Wisdom. But not everything profitable for meditation can be forged into a scientific proof. Not Philo alone, but Christian writers likewise, from the author of the Epistle of Barnabas to Gregory the Great, have abundantly shown how dangerous is the allegorization of history, and how it cuts like a two-edged sword. Heart and imagination will ever fondly ponder over these wonderful similarities and contrasts, but sober exegesis must eschew enthusiasm, and keep within the limits indicated by the sacred writers themselves. The fact that external appearances led the Jews into error, is a lesson to us to handle external similarities and references warily and cautiously. As "the "Jews had grown old in their carnal errors, Jesus came at the "appointed time, but not in pomp and splendour, as they had "expected, and they therefore did not believe that he was "the Messias. After his death S. Paul came to teach men "that all these things had been fulfilled spiritually; that the "Kingdom of God is in the spirit, not in the flesh; that the "enemies of men are not the Babylonians, but their own "passions; that God has no pleasure in temples made with "hands, but in a pure and humble heart; that while circum-

17 See *Orig. c. Cels.*, vii. 20.

* Ibid.

"cision of body is unprofitable, circumcision of heart is abso-
"lutely necessary."[18]

But does not this shake the proof drawn from the prophecies, even when taken as a whole? Anthony Collins, a disciple of Locke, astonished the Christian world by saying that the prophecies were the only real proof of Christianity, but that, as all the references to them in the New Testament rested on an allegorical interpretation, they could not be taken in a literal sense.[19] Woolston and other Deists agreed with him. Schenkel thinks it evident that the Messianic prophecies were not fulfilled in the manner in which they were originally spoken. Others contend that the Christian idea of the Messias, of his calling, and of the nature of salvation, is not to be found in its fulness either in the Old Testament or in pre-Christian Judaism. "The spirit of the times prompted "the first believers to assume that a deeper sense lay buried in "the Scriptures; and, in the light of this, they were able to "recognize their master as the Messias, although his portrait did "not tally with the description given in the avowedly direct "Messianic passages of the Old Testament, which first and "chiefly singled out the Messias as a theocratic king, and "a conqueror of the heathen."[20] Had Christians, then, really to construct a likeness of the Redeemer from the portraits, which the Psalms and Deutero-Isaias give of the persecuted and suffering just? Had they to gather together, from prophecy and poetry, the elements of perfect religion and morality, and knit them up in silken strings, in order to see therein the fulfilment of all the Messianic hopes of future ages? Such a "mistake," such self-deception" would be, to say the least, surpassing strange. But we make bold to put another question. It is contended that the origin of Messianic prophecy is to

18 Pascal, x. 5. See Mach., *Nothwendigkeit der Offenb.*, p. 298.

19 Denzinger, I. p. 184 seq.

20 Holtzmann. *Das Problem der Auslegung. Festschriften zum Heidelberger Jubilaeum*, 1886. p. 108. See Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah.* Edinburgh, 1886, Schurer, *Theol. Liter. Ztg.*, 1887, No. 5. Fritz, p. 143 seq.

be sought in the fact that it was the necessary condition of a full, comprehensive and consistent development of ideal mankind; or, again, that it was the solution of the mystery of sorrow that had so vainly tortured classical Greece; or, yet again, that the idea of a dying God, which so powerfully swayed the Gentile converts of the early Church, did but express the final reconciliation of the human heart with the tragedy of existence. But if this be so, how comes it that Jesus and his Apostles took such deep and firm hold of that general ideal conception of things and made it so completely their own? And, furthermore, how comes it that they could appeal to a fulfilment at once so striking, so convincing, and so irresistible, if there had been no actual warrant in the prophecies themselves?

Writers on the other side are never weary of extolling the depth of moral conception that is to be found in the prophets. Is there, then, no moral depth in the most momentous question with which they had to deal? Their duty, it is said, was to deepen man's consciousness of God. Deutero-Isaias, we are told, approximates very closely to Christian doctrine; and yet these same men declare that it strains them past the compass of their wits to find the Messias' spiritual character in the Old Testament!

And now, what is the truth? The primitive Church had not to grope in the dark in search of passages relating to the Redeemer's sufferings and meekness, and his redemption of man from sin and error, but simply to recognize the long-existing passages as such, and to believe in them. For now that men had been taught by the spirit and example of Christ, their understandings could soar to spiritual heights. Thus the Messianic idea was not transformed but completed. The outer veil fell, when the inner shrine was entered. It is objected that the actual data furnish no satisfactory explanation of the fact of a suffering Messias, because while they reveal "the whole web spun, the woof and warp threads

"which form the picture, escape observation."[21] The retort, however, is obvious. Is any explanation of a suffering Messias possible without Messianic prophecies and miracles of some kind? But since the objection implies that Christianity was evolved from the old world, an explanation is imperatively required. To say that, although the result lies before us, we cannot at present disentangle the skein, is to lay bare the utter hollowness of the whole theory.

Without a supernatural element the fact is inexplicable. Witnesses, who saw and heard Jesus from the first, record the words in which he himself has said that he came to fulfil the prophecies. Why, then, is this explanation barred? Because, forsooth, the prophecies were decked out in the historic dress of the time? But this explanation does not meet the whole case. "To test prophecies," says Pascal, "we must understand them. If we "suppose that they have but one meaning, then it is certain that "the Messias is not yet come; but if they have a double sense, "then it is certain that he came in Jesus Christ."[22] This saying, though one-sided, shows at least that a deeper sense underlies the prophecies, even when they are not directly Messianic. This sense, and the whole idea involved therein, must ever remain hidden from those who contend that Christianity has completely transformed the old Messianic idea.

So long as rationalistic exegesis is unable to discover an historical explanation of the psalms and prophecies that are exclusively Messianic; so long as it stops short at proving that a typical and Messianic sense cannot coexist with the historical; that religious hopes did not march under the banner of earthly expectations; and that no one looked for a religious reformation from the Messias;—it will never succeed in showing that later Judaism has found the true key to the prophets, or that Jesus, owing to the prevalent misconception, was able to represent himself as the suffering and dying Messias, and thus to

21 Fritz, p. 377.
22 xiii. 8.

make himself the centre of religious worship. The true Israelite conceives everything spiritually; he who takes everything literally can never understand holy Scripture and its many anthropomorphisms. The Old Testament itself says we should not make an image of God; God is he who is,—the absolute being. Who then would take it literally when, in spite of this, it speaks of God's hands and feet, eyes and ears, of His anger and zeal, and other affections? Why should not the descriptions of the Messias be adjusted to the same spiritual scale? The later Jews, not to mention the Alexandrines, were not unfamiliar with this method. The Erythræan Sibyl and the Messianic hopes entertained by the Samaritans, surely show traces of spiritual interpretation. The better-minded Jews in Palestine were also dissatisfied with the carnal sense. Because the Evangelists were obliged to give prominence to the common popular conceptions of the Messias, it has been inferred that this was the general view; while the many exceptions, of which the Evangelists themselves speak, have been overlooked. But when the "pious sense of Christians" is credited with transferring to Jesus the prophecies of a mighty king, it should be borne in mind that the Messianic Kingdom would have assumed a very different form, if the great majority of the Jews had then entered into it.

Hence it is quite intelligible that the Fathers regarded the proof from prophecy as the weightiest argument for the divine origin and preparation of the Christian religion. Always looking at the Old Testament in the light of the New, they even went so far as to say that in it lay the whole truth of Christianity. "Nothing "is to be admitted into the Faith that is not said in the inspired "Scripture (of the Old Testament)," is the remark of S. Cyril of Alexandria.[24] Origen had no difficulty in defending this faith against Celsus, who complained that Christians, while esteeming as miraculous and unchangeable commonplaces spoken in Judea, thought nothing of the Pythia and the oracles of the gods and heroes, although it was through their instrumentality that

24 To John viii. 44 (opp. vi. 559) Orig., vii. pp. 2, 3.

colonies were sent to all parts of the earth. Foı Origen was able not only to point to the disparaging verdicts of Greek philosophers, but also to show how little suited the oracles were to promote virtue and piety. Reason, he says, imperatively demands that we should regard as evil the spirits that abuse prophecy to deceive men, and to turn them away from God and piety. The extinction of the order of prophets among the Jews tells in favour of its divine institution. For it disappeared with the last prophet, John the Baptist, who was the forerunner of the Messias announced by the prophets.

CHAPTER XII.

THE TRUSTWORTHINESS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

The Scriptures were revered by the Jews as holy, as God's word, as inspired by God. For, according to Jewish tradition, they contained the deposit of divine wisdom that God had revealed to Moses and the prophets, to the Psalmist, and Solomon, and others. Our Lord and the Apostles found the Jewish Canon in existence, and used it to establish the mission of the Messias, and the divine origin of Christianity; it was the Messianic prophecies that made the Old Testament so valuable in the New Law; and as the need arose, the Apostles and their disciples composed the Scriptures of the New Testament. The two Testaments are placed side by side, and together constitute "Holy Scripture."

Before Christ the Old Testament numbered thirty books, as seen in the Septuagint. In the first century after Christ, Josephus tells us, the number had been reduced to twenty-two. Later on, at Babylon, the number had been fixed at twenty-four. This last enumeration is retained by the Jews to this day. The Christian Church adopted the Septuagint Canon, the text of which is used almost throughout the New Testament. But, in controversy with the Jews, the place of honour was assigned to the Hebrew Canon. Finally, according to the division in the Vulgate, the Old Testament comprised forty-six books! The Church made decrees con-

cerning the Canon of Scripture in a Roman Synod under Damasus (374), and in the Synods of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397). The first General Council to make the Canon universally obligatory was the Council of Trent which in its fourth session, enumerated the following books as belonging to the Old Testament :

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy } Five Books of Moses	1st Book of Esdras	Osee } Twelve minor prophets
	2nd „ „ (or Nehemias)	Joel
	Tobias	Amos
	Judith	Abdias
	Esther	Jonas
Josue	Job	Micheas
Judges	Psalms (150)	Nahum
Ruth	Proverbs	Habacuc
1st Book of Kings	Ecclesiastes	Sophonias
2nd „ „	Canticle of Canticles	Aggæus
3rd „ „	Wisdom	Zacharias
4th „ „	Ecclesiasticus	Malachias
Paralipomenon 1st	Isaias	1st of Machabees
„ 2nd	Jeremias (with Baruch)	2nd „
	Ezechiel	
	Daniel	

The books of the New Testament were written at different times and at different places. Hence time was required to collect the books, and to complete the Canon. In the above-named early Synods the Church declared twenty-seven books of the New Testament canonical. The Council of Trent also declared twenty-seven Books of the New Testament canonical, and its decision is final. And the Council arranged the Canon ot the New Testament immediately after that of the Old. It enumerates the following books :

The Gospel according to S. Matthew.
„ „ „ S. Mark.
„ „ „ S. Luke.
„ „ „ S. John.

The Acts of the Apostles written by the Evangelist S. Luke.

Fourteen Epistles of S. Paul, to wit:

To the Romans	To the Thessalonians (I and II.)
„ Corinthians (I. & II.)	„ Timothy (I and II.)
„ Galatians	„ Titus
„ Ephesians	„ Philemon
„ Philippians	„ Hebrews
„ Colossians	

1st Epistle of S. Peter.
2nd „ „
1st „ S. John
2nd „ „
3rd „ „
The Epistle of S. Jude
The Apocalypse of S. John the Apostle

The sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the common property of Christians of all denominations. As such they are held to contain divine revelation, their contents are of faith, and they are recognized as the rule of life. But before insisting on their inspired character, it is the apologist's bounden duty to establish the necessary preliminaries of this faith. It behoves him to show that the proof is of such certainty and general force as to form a solid groundwork for the faith of individuals, and of the Church at large. The trustworthiness of Holy Scripture needs a twofold demonstration: the one on external, the other on internal grounds. And even then we must bear in mind that this demonstration is not a positive, but only a negative proof, inasmuch as the objections urged against the divine origin of the Word of God are shewn to be futile; at most, it proves only the possibility or probability of revelation. God alone can furnish the immediate and positive

proof that the Scriptures contain His own word, and that He is their author.

This is not the place to give a detailed introduction to the Old and New Testaments. Only the chief points or leading principles can be noticed. Our course for the most part follows the beaten track. The history of the rise and growth of the Canon, and the many points at which Holy Scripture and profane history cross each other's frontier, make it incumbent on us to consider in the first place the external conditions or arguments. A criticism that breaks loose from all traditional precedent is sure to rush headlong down a precipice. How can a document be criticized except in the light of the historical circumstances attending its origin? To cast doubts on its genuineness is justifiable only when it can be shewn either not to have been produced at the time alleged, or to be in glaring contradiction with other writings that are undoubtedly genuine. But how is either one or the other point to be proved, if there are no certain historical data to go upon? Critics may insist, as much as they please, on making Scripture tell its own history by an analysis of its contents, but external testimony, as a disciple of the critical school opportunely reminds us, is not to be discarded.[a] From the very nature of the case, internal criticism must come in the second and subordinate place; nor can it, by itself, ever lay claim to establishing positive and generally valid conclusions.

In chapter V. we have said all that need be said about the Old Testament. For the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis is, as it were, a focus in which all the objections against the trustworthiness of the Scriptures of the Old Testament meet. The author of that hypothesis has also, at the same time, made an attempt to positively reconstruct the Old Testament writings. Now, if we have succeeded above in showing that the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis is at least uncertain, we are entitled at once to build up a positive argument for the trustworthiness of Scripture; because in that case, the most probable account of

a Ritschl, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 556

the origin of Scripture is clearly the one that history and tradition have hitherto assigned to it. But in claiming the highest probability for the traditional view, we do not mean to include the authorship of each particular book, nor even the exact date of composition, nor the interpretation of the contents of the books. For, as it is well known, in some books of the Old Testament no author's name is specified; in others, it is true, there are indications, but they are not such as to stifle the voice of doubt. Thus, in many Psalms for instance, the titles are the work of a later hand. On this point the Scriptures themselves are dumb. Even in the New Testament, the Gospels, the Epistles of S. John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews are, as the Jewish manner is, anonymous. Even Jewish tradition cannot speak with certainty as to the authors of some books of the Old Testament.

The Jews divided the Canon into three parts: The Law, the Prophets, and the Scriptures. The books, except those of the Law, occur in different order in the two versions. The Vulgate follows the Septuagint, with the one exception that the minor prophets are put at the end. As the books of the Law (Thorah) contain likewise much historical matter, they may be classed with the historical books; after these come the prophetical, and then the poetical books. The so-called Deuterocanonical books, which exist only in the Greek, constitute the essential difference between the Christian and Jewish Canons of the Old Testament. Protestants also regard the Deuterocanonical books as inferior and apocryphal. They are as follow:

Tobias
Judith
Wisdom
Ecclesiasticus (Sirach)
Baruch (with Epistle of Jeremias).
1st Book of Machabees
2nd Book of Machabees

This distinction between Protocanonical and Deuterocanonical does not concern us here; it belongs to the question of inspiration. The trustworthiness of these books may be discussed independently on its own merits; especially as they are all found in the LXX. Canon, and were consequently recognized before Christ, by the Alexandrine Jews, as of equal rank and authority with the Proto-canonical Scriptures.

The history of the formation of the Old Testament Canon is shrouded in uncertainty. The Scripture itself, as handed down by tradition, assigns the first and chief place to the Pentateuch, and makes it the groundwork of the Canon. Its authority naturally rested on tradition as the sole voucher. To the Book of the Law of the Lord, Josue added a further document* (the Book of Josue?) Then other historical books were added, and laid side by side with them.† When they are described‡ as "the books of Kings, of the prophets, and of David," the description suggests that the prophetical books and the Psalms were bound up with the historical books. The entire collection was variously styled the Scripture, Holy Scripture, the Books, the Sacred Books. The phrase, "the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms," likewise occurs in the Old Testament.§ The several writings that go to form the volume were not abandoned a prey to chance, but were committed to the safe keeping of the leaders of the people.‖ Subsequently, as tradition has it,** Ezechias instituted a Council for this special purpose, which is said to have continued to exist till the fifth century.[3] It is very probable that the scattered documents were not collected in a volume till the time of the kings,†† when it became possible to commit the sacred books to the care of

3 Kaulen, l.c. p. 17.
* Josue xxiv. 26.
† I. Kings, xx. 25.
‡ II. Mach. ii. 13.
§ Luke xxiv. 44; Acts xxviii. 23.
‖ Deut. xvii. 18; xxxi. 9.
** Proverbs xxv. 1.
†† IV. Kings xxii. 8.

the priests in the Temple.* After the collection was formed, the Psalms and the Prophets were added; some of them, the minor prophets for instance, forming a subdivision of their own.† To the proverbs of Solomon fresh additions were also made.‡

Under the second temple Nehemias established a library for the keeping of the books that had been gathered together out of the several countries; namely the books of David, and the prophets, the epistles of the kings, and the books of the holy gifts.§ In the opinion of the Jews the Canon was closed in the days of Esdras. But this opinion is unsupported by proof. Esdras was not a second Moses; he did but restore the Law. The Canon was fixed only in so far as it was made to include the writings of the Captivity, of Ezekiel and Daniel. Esdras, however, by the very fact of embodying these additions, bore witness that the Canon was not closed; and history says nothing to the contrary. This opinion was unheard of till the sixteenth century, when it was mooted by Elias, Levita, who died in 1549. After the Captivity, the "Great Synagogue," whose authority is highly commended by the Talmud, was commissioned to watch over the Canon. But the story that it closed the Canon is an unfounded legend. In connection with the Canon of Nehemias the Second Book of Machabees further says: "And in like manner Judas gathered together all such "things as were lost by the war we had, and they are in our "possession. Wherefore if you want these things, send some "that they may fetch them to you."‖ Whence it follows that both Egypt and Palestine were under the impression that the Canon was not yet closed; but that it might still be extended by the insertion of writings of equal value and authority. But as the Septuagint contains the same books as the Latin Vulgate,

* II. Chron. xxix. 30.

† Eccl. xlix. 12; Acts vii. 42.

‡ Prov. xxv 7.

§ II. Mach. ii. 13.

‖ II. Mach. ii. 14-15.

it is plain that the Jews in Egypt and Palestine must have possessed at that time the more comprehensive Canon. There is no mention even then of any closing of the Canon. On the other hand, we know that, as the political outlook became more and more cheerless and hopeless, the "official interpreters of the Law," established after the captivity, were driven to cling more and more to the mere letter of the law, and to enter upon a course of casuistical exegesis. It was now laid down as a principle, that Scriptures to be recognized as Canonical must have three qualities: they must be old, they must have seen the light on the soil of Palestine, and they must be in perfect accord with the law of Moses.[4] Even parts of the Hebrew Canon failed to fulfil one or other of these conditions; but allegory smoothed away the contradiction. The Deutero-canonical books and some parts of Daniel and Esther were thus expunged from the Canon. This purge, though at first not generally accepted, gradually grew in favour with the Jews. When at last the theocracy had been buried beneath the ruins of the City and Temple, the only treasure left to the orthodox Jew was his Hebrew Bible, which, according to Josephus, consisted of twenty-two books, corresponding to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, namely: Five books of Moses, thirteen prophetical (from Moses to Artaxerxes), and four liturgical and ascetical books. The later writings did not, he says, enjoy the same authority, because the succession of prophets had died out.[5]

Jesus and the Apostles made use of the Jewish Canon as they found it, and thus by their manner of appeal, recognized, both in general and in particular, the Old Testament as the sacred Scriptures of the Jews.[6] The writers of the New, however, following a custom not infrequent among the Jews, sometimes quote the Old Testament from memory,—a circumstance which

4 Kaulen, p. 19. Cornely, *Histor. et Crit. Introd. in U. T. libros sacros*. Paris, 1885, I, p. 37 seq.

5 *Contr. Ap.* I. 8.

6 Kuhn, *Einleitung*, p. 105.

at times makes it difficult to verify or prove the reference. In the Epistles the Septuagint version is used throughout, but the Gospels, especially that of S. Matthew, have an eye also to the Hebrew text. Some writers have even gone so far as to infer from the character of the quotations, that Jesus and the Apostles made use of a popular Syriac Bible.[7] That no Deuterocanonical books are quoted in the New Testament need not excite surprise, since all the writers, excepting S. Luke, the disciple of S. Paul, were converts from Judaism. But neither is allusion made to some Protocanonical books: Ruth, Esdras, Nehemias, Abdias, Nahum, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticle of Canticles.

Subsequently the prevalent ignorance of Hebrew rendered the use of the Septuagint obligatory on Christians. To all intents and purposes the Septuagint became the Christian Bible; although, when engaged in controversy with the Jews, some set greater store by the Jewish Canon. Melito of Sardis travelled to Palestine for the special purpose of studying it. The Synod of Laodicea and certain Greek writers pass over in silence the books of Judith, Tobias, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and Machabees (cap. 60). Jerome perpetuated the distinction between the Canonical and Non-Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, between the sacred Scriptures and writings that served to edify. Junilius, to justify his rejection of Job, Canticles, Chronicles, Esdras and the Deuterocanonical book appeals, though wrongly, to the Jewish Canon, to Jerome and others; but he is really working on the Canon of Theodore of Mopsuesta.[8] And yet Junilius does not reject them root and branch, but assigns them a middle place of authority. Jerome's distinction, which after all is more important in theory than in practice, held its ground till the Council of Trent. In practice both kinds were used promiscuously, and the Council of Trent, in putting them, by a formal decree, on the same footing, set a seal on the previous practice of the Church.

8 Kuhn, p. 360.

The text, then, of the Old Testament is contained in two sources. The Greek Septuagint contains all the books, while the Hebrew Bible has only the text of the Proto-canonical books. The original Hebrew text, doubtless, was more proof against corruption, because, soon after the last books had been written, Hebrew ceased to be a living language. And although it was subsequently cultivated by the learned for liturgical purposes, the very fact of its being used within these narrow limits safeguarded it against dialectic changes. But no Hebrew MS. is older than the ninth or tenth century.[9] These MSS. represent the text as established by the Masora in the 6th or 7th century. In earlier times the measures adopted for preserving the text pure were not quite so satisfactory. The loud complaints that the Fathers uttered against the Jews for corrupting the Hebrew text were often, it is true, due to misunderstandings; still the Masoretic text, when compared with the Samaritan Pentateuch, is seen to have deteriorated. The translation of the Septuagint, begun at Alexandria soon after 300 B.C., and completed[10] at short intervals, existed in MS. as late as the fourth century A.D. It is not a literal translation, and so Aquila and Theodotion were emboldened to try and improve on it. Further emendations were made by Hesychius and Lucian. Origen tried to restore the genuine text by means of his Hexapla.

The Old and New Testaments, moreover, were likewise at an early time translated into different languages. The most important translations are the (*Peschittho*) and the Latin translation (*Itala*, *Vulgata*). The Peschittho (i.e. clear, self-evident, literal), called by the Syrians *simple*, is in reality more faithful to the phrase and sense, than to the letter. The oldest part, comprising the Protocanonical books, was probably the work of several Jewish translators in the first century. Before the 4th century the Deutero-canonical books had been added. This was the form in which S. Ephraem knew it.

9 Kaulen, p. 63 seq.
10 See the *Prologue to Ecclus.*

For the peoples subject to Rome, especially in such countries as Africa, in which Greek was all but unknown, a Latin translation became an absolute necessity. In Italy itself the necessity was not so great, as Greek was generally understood by the educated. S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, S. Mark's Gospel destined for the Romans, and the Letter of S. Ignatius the Martyr to the same, were all written in Greek. Clement of Rome, in the latter part of the first century, also wrote in Greek. Probably, therefore, a Latin translation was not a desideratum in Italy in the first century, nor at the beginning of the second. Although S. Paul found a Christian community at every stage of his journey, the country, on the whole, was but slowly preparing for Christianity. Hence when Innocent I., in 414, describes the Roman (Latin) Liturgy as constituted by S. Peter, it does not follow that he was referring to an early official translation. There was no tradition to this effect, as is clear from Rufinus, who writing to S. Jerome in 405 says: there can be no doubt that S. Peter, besides other necessary instructions, must have committed to the Church the instruments of proof, that is the sacred books.[11]

It would seem, therefore, that S. Augustine's opinion as to the origin of Latin translations is the most probable: "In the first ages of faith whenever a Greek version "chanced to fall into the hands of some one, who thought "himself an adept in both Latin and Greek, he hazarded "a translation."[12] Although he speaks of the Latins in general it is evident that he had Africa chiefly in mind. The passages quoted by African Ecclesiastical writers are found both to agree and disagree on many points,—which would hardly be possible if a generally received version had been in existence. Tertullian, indeed, alludes to a translation in common use; but even his quotations are often variable. The passage in question[13] is supposed to refer to the Itala. But, besides omitting to give its name,

11 See Aberle-Schanz, *Einl. in das N. T.*, p. 301. Cornely, l.c. p. 358. Kaulen, p. 109.
12 *De Doctr. Christ.*, II. ii. 15.
13 *Adv. Praxeam* 5.

Tertullian leaves us in doubt whether he means a definite translation, when he speaks of the one "in use among our people." For he merely observes that, owing to the simple Latin rendering in Africa, λόγος is usually translated by *sermo*, not by *ratio*. And yet, on the other hand, his remark on the I. Cor. vii., 39,[14] shows that a peculiar text had made its way into Africa. Again, such terms as *translatio vetus*, *antiqua interpretatio*, *vulgata editio*, point in the same direction as regards Italy. Augustine, in the passage already quoted, says that he prefers the *Itala* to the numerous Latin translations afloat, because of its verbal agreement with the original, and also because in it the thought is clearly expressed. Were these others merely different recensions of the same version, or, independent translations? This question is more easily asked than answered. They certainly did not embrace the whole of Scripture. In view of these many one-sided attempts at translation, similar to Gnostic translations of S. Matthew's Gospel from the Hebrew, of which Papias speaks, it would seem very probable that, by way of correction, the ecclesiastical authorities issued a translation about the middle of the second century. Its birthplace, as the name it bore seems to indicate, would be Italy, whence Christianity had passed over to Africa. Different recensions, of course, could scarcely be avoided. They drew from Jerome loud and grievous complaints. This old Latin version, of which we are speaking, was made from the Septuagint. Jerome brought it again in harmony with the Hebrew, i.e. he translated the Hebrew and Chaldaic books of the Old Testament from the original into Latin, with some regard, however, for existing usage (390–405). In this way the Vulgate, i.e., Jerome's translation, both by reason of its form and matter, was raised to the place of honour among the old versions. But only by slow degrees, and after encountering a storm of opposition, was it able to gain a footing in the Western Church. Not till the seventh century was

14 *De Monogam.* 11.

it generally used. By desire of the Council of Trent, Pope Sixtus the Fifth issued an official edition which, when found to be critically inaccurate, was withdrawn. A revised and improved edition was put forward with the authority of Clement VIII. in 1592; and this was printed in 1593 and again in 1598 with comparatively few mistakes. This last edition issued in 1598 was declared to be the standard for all future editions.

Both translations contain the New Testament Canon as it then existed. With the exception of St. Matthew's Gospel, the New Testament still exists in the Greek original, in which it was written; but the autograph MSS., being written on poor paper and constantly used, were soon lost. When Tertullian speaks of authentic copies, he means not the originals, but the text in an incorrupt state. Nevertheless, with frequent use, slight variations and interpolations would easily, despite all precautions, creep into the text; but they are mostly unimportant, and leave points of doctrine untouched. In some few passages,* however, the discrepancies are more momentous. But as the oldest MSS. (Vatican and Sinaitic) go back to the fourth century, and as there are several good MSS. with which to collate them, the text may be fixed with tolerable certainty. The latest editions of Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott, are accurate and precise in a remarkable degree.

The Peschittho was completed towards the end of the second century. In what relation it stood to other Syriac recensions has not yet been ascertained. It contains the 4 Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle of S. James, the 1st Epistles of SS. Peter and John, the 14 Epistles of St. Paul; the five missing books being inserted at a later period, probably in the 6th century. Anyhow the full collection was known to S. Ephraem (d. 373 or 378), who probably found them all together in some ecclesiastical translation. But the church of Edessa in the 3rd century did not recognize the Catholic Epistles or the Apocalypse.

* Mark xvi. 9–20; John viii. 1–10; I. John v. 7.

Of the Itala only a few fragments remain, so that its extent cannot be exactly determined. Still we are not altogether at sea as to the extent of the Latin Canon. The information supplied by Latin writers, Tertullian in particular, is amply sufficient, though some uncertainty still attaches to the Catholic Epistles. The extent of the African Canon, however, is quite clear from the *Codex Claromontanus* of the 3rd century, which contains all the New Testament writings; but at the end, as was then customary, some uncanonical writings destined for public reading, are appended. The extent of the Roman Canon has been disclosed by the important *Fragmentum Muratorianum* (2nd century), which purports to give the received canon of the sacred books; whence it has been called the Muratorian Canon. Its weight in the present question is evidently immense. The Latin text (which many critics hold to be a translation from the Greek) is very defective, as beginning and end are both missing; but the 4 Gospels, the Acts and 13 Epistles of S. Paul are clearly contained. It also mentions the 1st Epistle of S. John, and alludes to the Apocalypse.

For the Canon of the Church of Alexandria we are indebted to Origen. In his critical and scientific examination he consigns the 2nd Epistle of S. Peter, and the 2nd and 3rd Epistles of S. John to the category of disputed Scriptures, and passes over in silence the Epistles of Jude and James. But in his Commentaries and Homilies (of which only a Latin version is extant), he uses these books just the same as the other Scriptures. And he takes this line of action not merely as a preacher, accommodating himself to ecclesiastical usage, but as professedly giving the Canon of the Church, which is not to be set aside for the sake of a few critical considerations. Even if, as R. Simon and others contend, his sole motive was to avoid giving offence, and if, moreover, he spoke against his convictions, this distinction between the "preacher and the professor" would even so bear witness to the general belief of

the Church. Other books, not classed even among the Scriptures in dispute, are set down as fit to be used for scientific purposes, but not for proving the faith. In his *Epistola Festalis* (xlix.) S. Athanasius enumerates all the books of the New Testament. The Canon of Eusebius, too, contains all the New Testament Scriptures, but ranks the Catholic Epistles, the 1st of SS. Peter and John excepted, among the disputed Scriptures, while the Apocalypse, which from the third century onwards was distasteful to the Greeks, is mentioned both as genuine, and not genuine Scripture. The Conciliar decrees regarding the Canon have been mentioned above.[15]

This general sketch of the external credentials of the New Testament would suffice, were not this central point of revelation so frequently and so violently assailed To enter into the proofs more minutely will not therefore be beating the air. In the first place, it is generally admitted that the four great Pauline Epistles must pass unchallenged. To these the Apostolic Fathers bear witness. Nor is there much controversy as regards the Epistles to the Philippians or to Philemon, or the 1st Epistle to the Thessalonians. But as far as external evidence is concerned, the rest of the Pauline Epistles are in no sense behind those just named. The Gnostic Theodotus quotes the 1st Epistle to Timothy, and Clement of Rome quotes both this Epistle and that to Titus. Only in regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews did dissensions arise in the Western Church. The doubt was, perhaps, due to internal grounds (matter of penance); again the Greeks, on account of the difference of style, may have imagined that its immediate author was Apollo, Luke, or Clement of Rome. Three of the Catholic Epistles, the 1st of S. John, the 1st of S. Peter and the Epistle of S. James were generally admitted at an early age. There was, however, at one time, some slight hesitation and wavering with regard to the Epistle of S. James. The case was different with the 2nd Epistle of S. Peter. In the time of Eusebius and Jerome many looked upon

15 See Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 2 Ed. II. p. 618.

it as not genuine. Didymus even pronounces it in set terms a forgery, made public indeed, but not admitted into the Canon. But from Jerome we learn that internal reasons had delayed its general recognition. The style and character were such as to lead to the supposition that S. Peter employed a different amanuensis in each Epistle. Moreover, it shared the fate of the other Catholic Epistles, which were less favourably received by S. Paul's Gentile Christians. And yet there are indications that it was in use in the second century. Polycarp, who made copious extracts from the 1st Epistle, once quotes the second. Ephraem cites it as Canonical Scripture. We conclude therefore that, if the said Epistle maintained itself in the teeth of the internal evidence, there must have been a good solid tradition to fall back upon.

The credentials of the Apocalypse were so ancient and respectable, that it was never called in question in the West. Justin, who mentions no other New Testament author by name, distinctly states that John was the author of the Apocalypse. The Greek opposition, led by Dionysius of Alexandria, was too clearly dictated by opposition to the Millenium to militate against the external evidence. Its language is certainly most unlike that of the other Epistles of St. John; but this difference is easily accounted for by its Apocalyptic and Hebraising character. Dionysius knew well how to utilize this fact for his own purpose. But even Dionysius dared not call in question its Canonical character. He merely wished to transfer the authorship to some other John. Leontius also includes the Apocalypse in his Canon, and in conclusion observes: "These "are the books, old and new, admitted into the Canon of "the Church; but the Hebrews receive the Old to the exclusion "of the New."[16]

As the *Acts of the Apostles* is closely connected in form and plan with the 3rd Gospel, and clearly reveals the eyewitness, it now only remains to consider the Gospels. The earliest

16 Kihn, *Theodor von Mops.* p. 64.

testimony is in favour of St. Matthew's. The oldest Fathers use it generally in preference to the others. Papias of Hierapolis, a disciple of S. John, is the first to mention it by name. He merely says, indeed, that Matthew collected and put into Hebrew the sayings of our Lord (λόγια κυριακά), but as it can be proved to demonstration that in his time the Canonical Gospel of Matthew was generally recognized, the term λόγια cannot very well mean anything else than the Gospel. Following the precedent set in Holy Scripture* and by Clement of Rome, he used the expression to denote a divine revelation. And, singularly enough, the term is most applicable to S. Matthew's Gospel, which is remarkable for containing large groups of our Lord's discourses; and in this respect it stands in marked contrast to the Gospel of S. Mark. Papias is also the first formal witness to the Gospel of S. Mark, which he derives from the oral discourses of Peter. He was even acquainted with S. John's Gospel; and Eusebius testifies that he quoted from the 1st Epistle of S. John.[17] This last was certainly known to Polycarp, who also bears witness to the Gospel. To S. Ignatius also the Gospel was known. When Justin, who used the Gospel of S. John, says that the Gospels were written by the Apostles and their disciples, at least two such Gospels must have been in existence. His remark, too, quite fits in with the ecclesiastical number, Four. Irenæus proves the fitness of this number from the four quarters of the heavens, the winds, &c. Against the Gnostic Marcian, who mutilated S. Luke's Gospel and rejected the others, Tertullian thus writes: "I contend that not merely in the Apostolic Churches, but in "all that are united in one community of mystery, this Gospel "of S. Luke existed from the time it was first published; hence "we defend it tooth and nail. But Marcian's Gospel is unknown "to the majority, and no one knows it but condemns it. "The Apostolic Churches likewise revered the other Gospels,

17 See *Commentar zu Johannes*, p.
* Romans iii. 2.

"that we have received from them, viz., the Gospels of John "and Matthew, and also that of Mark, as the Gospel of S. Peter "is called, whose interpreter Mark was. For the Gospel of "Luke is usually ascribed to S. Paul. The authority of the "Masters passes on to the publications of the disciples."

Origen appeals to the tradition in favour of the four Gospels, which alone were allowed to pass unchallenged by the whole Church.[18] For the last Gospel, moreover, the oldest heretics can be summoned as witnesses. For, in the beginning of the 2nd century, the Gnostics used this very Gospel of John to build up their system of emanation and dualism.

The positive evidence of antiquity including that of Eusebius as to the time when the Gospels were compiled is rather vague; but all agree that the Synoptic Gospels were written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Catholics generally explain the passage in Eusebius to mean that the 1st Gospel was compiled in 42 A.D., the second from 43-44; and the third in the year 63. In support of the latter date in particular, it is usual to quote the concluding passage of the Acts of the Apostles, which states that Paul was in prison for two years. But Eusebius gives no precise dates. His declaration that S. Peter first tarried in Rome in the year 42 is not historically certain; and again it must not be confused with the assertions of Papias and Clement of Alexandra as to the origin of S. Mark's Gospel. To these indefinite statements may be opposed the older and certain testimony of Irenæus, the Greek text of which Eusebius himself has preserved. According to him Matthew's Gospel was written when Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel in Rome; therefore, not before 61 A. D.; S. Mark's after their their death, or certainly not before 65 A.D.; S. Luke's immediately after S. Mark's. To interpret this passage in favour of the composition in 43 would necessitate correction in the text of so violent and wrenching a nature, that the very attempt

18 Irenaeus, *adv. haer.* III. 11, 8. Tertull., *adv. Marc.* iv. 5. 2. Orig. ap. Euseb. H.E. vi. 25. See Aberle-Schanz, *Einl.* p. 275, and also the commentaries of Schanz.

proclaims the uncertainty of the issue. The motive why later writers have tried to date back the Gospels written by the disciples is too transparent to be hid.[19] Anyhow, these Gospels bear the stamp of the Apostolic age.

No other ancient writings can produce equally good credentials. Long ago Augustine replied to the attacks of Faustus, the Manichæan: "How do we know that the works of Plato, "Aristotle, Cicero and Varro were written by these authors, "except by the continuous testimony of those who came after "them? Many have written a great deal about the literature of the "Church, not indeed with Canonical authority, but with " a view to learning and utility. How do we know the "author of each book, except that each author declared it, at the "time he wrote, to men who would hand it on? In this way the "knowledge was transmitted from mouth to mouth; took firm "root in those that followed, and has thus come down even to our "own times.[20]" Thus if a continuous line of witnesses vouch for the authorship, it ought to be sufficient. Strauss' criterion is surely preposterous. He demands the testimony of one personally acquainted with the author, that is of a witness, who either saw the work written, or received the author's assurance that he had written it. If this were really necesary, would not this testimony also require corroboration? and so on *in infinitum?*

But, does the guarantee demanded for profane writings suffice for Holy Scripture? We are speaking, be it observed, merely of the requisites for human faith, for natural and historical trustworthiness, not of the motive of supernatural faith, which, as apologists of note like Tertullian and Origen have strenuously declared, must in the last instance be sought in the Church guided by the Holy Spirit. Now it so happens that the number of witnesses on behalf of the historical character of the sacred books is overwhelming; and the

19 Euseb. II. 14 seq. Iren. III. 1, 1. Cf. Euseb. v. 10, 2. See Schanz, *Commentar zu Math.*, p. 46.

20 *C. Faust. Man.*, xxxiii. 6.

Church took every precaution against falsification. We may pass over the Jewish testimonies, because for the Christian the authority of the Old Testament rests entirely on that of the New. Now the books of the New Testament were addressed to Christian communities, or some faithful of standing; they were kept and read in the particular Churches, were copied under supervision, and their contents were communicated to others in a duly attested form. The Churches alone could undertake the office of public witness, but their guarantee was ample. From the first, these pearls of divine wisdom were guarded with the greatest jealousy. Even in the Apostolic letters, various stringent precautions were taken. Thus, when the Epistles were dictated, the autograph signature of the authors was attached,* and attention was directed to this point,† and to the character of the writing.‡ Writer and addressee are expressly mentioned by name.§ Paul sent his letters by special messengers, just as the decision of the Council of Jerusalem was conveyed to Antioch by chosen delegates. The 1st Epistle of S. John may be regarded as recommending the Gospels to the friends of the writer. S. Paul ordered his letters to be read to all the faithful,‖ and then to be forwarded to another community.** Sometimes the dedication marked out the letter as destined for a wider circle of readers.†† At the conclusion of the Apocalypse‡‡ anathemas are hurled against those who add or subtract aught from its contents. S. Peter§§ himself refers to the Epistles of S. Paul. There is good ground for supposing that this letter was intended to secure a better reception for the letter of Jude. Of course,

* I. Cor. xvi. 21; Corlos. iv. 18.
† II. Thessal. iii. 17.
‡ Galat. vi. 11.
§ Rom. xvi. 22; I. Pet. v. 12; Rom. xvi. 17; Ephes. vi. 22; Philipp. II. 25.
‖ I. Thess. v. 27.
** Coloss. iv. 16.
†† I. Cor. i. 1; II. Cor. i. 1; Philipp. i. 1.
‡‡ Apoc. xxii. 18, 19. Cfr. Deut. v. 2.
§§ II. Peter iii. 15.

the historical books contain no such indications; but we may be quite sure that they were not less carefully watched.

Nor, again, it is unnecessary to observe, were the precautions taken in sending copies from place to place less stringent. Special notes given to the bearers were the chief of these safeguards. Such commendatory letters were given when members of the community were setting out on a journey.* The very institution of *litteræ commendatitiæ* proves how circumspect Christian were in their behaviour before strangers. From which we may certainly infer that they were not less circumspect in dealing with writings that were to be read at divine service. Moreover the Epistle of Polycarp (d. 155), the disciple of the Apostle John, proves that it was thought necessary to give an accompanying note even with writings of less importance. For this purpose he sent a letter with the collection of the Epistles of S. Ignatius which he despatched to Philippi. But Polycarp, like the Apostle, by giving the name of the bearer, also testifies that this precaution was in general use. The Epistle to the Philippians† shows that the Apostolic letters were preserved with the greatest care by those to whom they were sent. The growing intercourse between the Christian communities, to which the scoffer Lucian alludes, was a powerful means for controlling the use of the Sacred Scriptures. From the beginning of the second century this means was particularly efficacious. "We are united," says Tertullian, "with the Apostolic Churches; so that no difference exists in doctrine; this is the testimony of truth."[31] The fact that Christians, in times of persecution, preferred to lay down their lives rather than give up their sacred books, proves the esteem in which they were held. He who betrayed the books was a traitor (*traditor*).

Hence it was impossible for a spurious, interpolated Scripture to obtain any extensive canonical authority. The Apocry-

31 *De Praescript.* xxi. See Aberle, p. 270.

* Romans xvi. 1; II. Cor. 1-3; I. Cor. ix. 2.

† c. xii.

phal Gospel of Peter is the only known case where orthodox Christians believed it to be genuine Scripture. This, however, happened not in an Episcopal See, but in the remote parish of Rhossos on the coast of Syria, and ceased as soon as it came to the ears of Bishop Serapion. And the ground on which it was prohibited is noteworthy: "For we," said the Bishop, "beloved "brother, receive Peter and the other Apostles like Christ; but, "being well-instructed, we reject what is falsely ascribed to "them, knowing that such has not been handed down to us."[22] *Handed down* and *not handed down*, were then, as they have ever been, the watchwords of the Fathers and of the Church at large. Quotations from the Apocryphal Gospels were put out of court, by the bare fact that they were not in the "four Gospels handed down."[23] That Serapion and Clement scanned the contents, and saw in their unworthiness a secondary reason for the spuriousness of the book in nowise tells against the principle of tradition. Without this authoritative principle at his back, we readily grant that the decision of Serapion, in testing a professedly apostolic document, by the Catholicity of its contents, would have been unique and quite unparallelled in the whole range of ecclesiastical literature.[24] In Eusebius' eyes the principle of tradition overtops all others. It is the positive, whereas the contents are but the negative criterion. Thus Serapion stands firm as representing the principle of Apostolicity.[25] If then it was so difficult to smuggle an apocryphal book into one parish that had no bishop, we may imagine the obstacles that would bar the way to its being recognized by the universal Church. Ecclesiastical writings, though read aloud in the Churches, were not placed on an equal footing with the canonical books. A priest of Asia Minor, who published in good faith the Acts of Paul and Thecla under the name of Paul, was sus-

22 Euseb. vi. 12, 3 (Ed. L.

23 Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 3, 13, p. 465 (553) See Luthardt, *Johan. Ursprung*, p. 39.

24 Overbeck. *Zur Geschichte des Canons*, 1880, p. 82.

25 Harnack, *Ueber das Murator. Fragment. in Zeitschr. fur Kirchengesch*, 1879, p

pended.[26] The 60th (59th) Apostolic Canon, which, judged by its contents, belongs to the second century, pronounces excommunication against those who diffuse apocryphal books. Augustine says of the Apocrypha, "they are not admitted because, being composed, on some pretence or other, by some unknown person, they are unconfirmed by any light of testimony."

On the other hand even Canonical Scriptures were vetoed, as long as the guarantee for their genuineness was insufficient. The Church preferred to incur the risk of refusing recognition to genuine Scripture, rather than falsify the Canon by a hasty acceptance of a book not fully accredited. This explains the reserve maintained towards several of the Catholic Epistles, the Apocalypse, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the case of the last two, internal reasons weighed, but did not turn the scale. A book, that had not been testified to as Canonical by tradition, was never accepted as such merely because it was consonant with faith. Only in special cases was it sought to compensate for the want of a *universal* tradition by internal reasons. Even if it be granted that "the most distinguished "among the ancient Fathers" was utterly wanting not merely in the art, but even in the idea of historical criticism, it by no means follows that "the recognition or inheritance of an "ecclesiastical writing, as far as we can judge, was never deter-"mined on historical, but only on dogmatic, theological and "religious grounds, and in accordance with the interests of the "Church."[27] The exact contrary is the case. Holy Scripture, in particular, was vindicated by appealing to the tradition of the Apostolic Churches. "Where doctrines vary, the Scriptures are "falsified. Those who intended to broach different doctrines "were compelled to resort to a different arrangement of the "instruments of teaching. For they could not have taught "differently without the wherewith to teach. As the falsification "of doctrine could not have succeeded without falsifying the

26 Tertull., *De Bapt.* xvii. See Aberle, p. 289.
27 Zeller, *Apostelgeschichte*, Stuttgart, 1854. p. 72.

"instruments of doctrine, so pure doctrine would never have "come down to us unless that by which doctrine is tested had "been preserved intact."[28]

It was considered as self-evident that none but Apostolic writings could be Canonical. The Church is built on the foundation of the Apostles and prophets.* The Apostles are instructed and sent by our Lord. He who hears them hears our Lord. "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you"† said the risen Saviour, at a solemn moment. "All power is "given to me in heaven and on earth. Going therefore teach ye "all nations."‡ Jesus promised that the Apostles should be endued with power from on high, to be His witnesses in Jerusalem and all Judea and Samaria to the ends of the earth,§ and He promised that the Holy Ghost should lead them into all truth. S. Paul appeals for his Gospel to an immediate revelation from God. Hence it passed as a strict principle that only writings of Apostolic origin were regarded as the mouthpiece of Christian doctrine and morality. "If it is a fixed principle that "that is truer which is earlier, that is earlier which is from the "beginning, that is from the beginning which is from the Apostles, "it will, in like manner, be held as a fixed principle that only "that is handed down from the Apostles which is esteemed "sacred in the Churches."[29] In the ancient Church prophets were held in the greatest reverence. The "Teaching of the "Apostles" (Didachē) reminds us that they are to be received as prophets. Melito of Sardis acknowledges the continuance of the prophetic spirit,[30] which, however, utters nothing new, but only instructs in the doctrine of Jesus and the Apostles. When the Montanists uttered new sayings, they were cast out of the

28 Tertull. *De Praescr.*, xxxvii.

29 Tertull., *Adv. Marc.*, iv. 5. Iren, iii. 3, 1, 4. See Kuhn, *Einleit.* p. 62. *Theol. Quart.*, 1858, pp. 3, 185.

30 Holtzmann, *Ein. in das N.T.* 1886, p. 127.

* Eph. ii. 19.

† John xx. 21.

‡ Matth. xxviii. 18.

§ Acts 1. 18.

Church. Some profess to see in the Valentinian School the same inward development as in the Church, because sacred writings, prophecy and gnosis receded more and more into the background, and the fixed Canon became the chief basis of religious teaching.[31] Apostolic doctrine, safeguarded by Apostolic succession, was to the Fathers the sum total and quintessence of truth. "Our Lord gave "to the Apostles full power to preach the Gospel. Through "them we have learnt to know the truth taught by the Son "of God. To them our Lord said :* 'He that heareth "'you heareth me : and he that despiseth you despiseth "'me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent "'me.' From them alone we have received the Gospel "which our Lord commissioned them to preach ; and by "God's will they have handed down to us in the Scriptures "this Gospel which is the foundation and pillar of our "faith."[32] "What the Apostles handed down was faith-"fully preserved in the communities they founded, and "thence it was diffused to other places, which the Apos-"tles had taught in harmony with their writings."

The Apostolic writings, and they alone, ranked equally with Apostolic preaching and tradition : Apostolicity was the test of Holy Scripture. Says Tertullian against Marcion :† "We hold, first of all, that the Gospel (*instrumen-"tum*), from which we draw proof, has, for its author, the "Apostles, whom our Lord Himself entrusted with the duty "of preaching the Gospel. If apostolic men also [were "authors], yet they were not alone but [acted] with and "according to the [instructions of the] Apostles ; for am-"bition might drag the preaching of the disciples through "the mire were not the authority of the master at hand "to support them." No bishop, however near to Apos-"tolic times, claimed Apostolic authority for his words.

31 Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, 1879, p. 188.

32 Iren. III. *Praef.* c. 1, 1, 10, 1.

* Luke x. 16.

† (4.2.)

"Neither I nor any other," says S. Polycarp, "can succeed to "the wisdom of the blessed and glorious S. Paul, who, when he "was among you, taught exactly and safely the word of truth, "and who also, when absent, wrote you letters. If you drink "deep of these, you will be built up into the faith handed down "to you." And S. Augustine says: "The high Canonical 'authority of the Old and New Testament, which was accorded "to the Apostles, must not be extended to the writings of later "authors . . . . whose authority is far less, although "many of them contain the same truths."[33] S. Augustine applies this distinction to his own writings. In like manner S. Thomas says: "Our faith rests on the revelation made to the Apostles "and prophets, who wrote the Canonical Scriptures, not on a "revelation made to any other teachers."[34] If, now and again, the Fathers seem to draw a distinction between Apostolic and Canonical, their general principle still holds its ground. Writing on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Jerome says: it matters little who is its author since, in any case, he was a man of the Church, and his Epistle is daily honoured by being read in the Churches; whereas, he says, that the Epistle to Philemon, as even those who defend its genuineness maintain, would never have been received by all the Churches, had it not been considered an Epistle of Paul.[35] So we may say with S. Augustine:[36] "Holy "Scripture was committed to posterity for the building up of "our faith, not by unknown persons, but by the Apostles them-"selves. For this reason it has been invested with Canonical "authority, and therefore its truth must be made secure and "indubitably certain on every side."

Apostolicity was therefore the recognized principle in the formation of the Canon of the New Testament, as appears from the ancient Roman Canon. The author of the *Fragmentum*

33 *C. Faust.* xi. 5. *C. Crescon. Donat.* II. 31, 39. *C. duas Epp. Pel.* iv. 8, 20. *Ep. ad Fortun.* See Aberle, p. 268. Kuhn, *Einl* p. 396, 513.

34 S. Thom. I. Q. I. a: 8 ad 2.

35 *Ep. ad Dard.* 129. See Aberle, p. 269

36 *Ep. 82, 7a ad Hier*

Muratorianum requires at least a mediate Apostolic origin for Canonical writings. His partial objection to the Apocalypse, on the ground that it is not read in some Churches, does not tell against the principle of Apostolicity, but against the genuineness of the writing; but it does tell against the opinion that no sacred writings of Apostles, except Apocalypses, were known before the middle of the 2nd century.[37] Whether he was cognizant of the Apostolic origin of the Epistle of Jude, and of the 2nd and 3rd Epistles of S. John, or merely received them on the testimony of the Church, the text leaves uncertain. Anyhow, he regards ecclesiastical tradition and custom as a proof of Apostolicity. These two cannot be separated; for it is the authority of the Church that is to the faithful a guarantee of the Apostolicity. The same author, indeed, in the case of S. John's Gospel and the two Epistles of S. Peter, also draws a proof from their agreement in doctrine with the other Scriptures, especially those of the first Apostles; but he does not thereby set aside the principle of Apostolicity or tradition. Rather he was but following the example of Irenaeus, Tertullian and others who, in defending truth against heretics, while ever urging the principle of Apostolicity and ecclesiastical tradition acted in precisely the same way. Anyhow, we may safely conclude that the "New Testament of our Author" represents "the original collection of writings, immediately or "mediately Apostolic, which the Church used for teaching "sound doctrine."[38] Naturally, the operation of the decisive principle of Apostolicity[39] would be somewhat curtailed by a further criterium (Catholicity) in the case of books, which, not being received by all the Churches, were consequently not so certainly of Apostolic origin. The Church selected only such writings as were in use in the church, and admitted none but those which were traditionally the genuine work of the Apostles.

37 Harnack, *Zeitschr. fur Kircheng.* 1879, p. 358.
38 Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. fur Wiss. Theol.* 1881, p. 160.
39 Overbeck, l.c. pp. 5, 11, 74, 104. Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1874, p. 121.

The Church received only such writings as bore the names of Apostles, or had been handed down as Apostolic. The *Fragmentum Muratori* acknowledges the right of the Church to define what books belong to the Canon; but it neither hints that writings, which have no direct or indirect Apostolic origin, are admitted, nor does it give us to understand that there are any writings of Apostles, which, though not addressed to the universal Church, are excluded. It would have been strange indeed if the author of the fragment had not applied the principle[40] which stood unchallenged in Tertullian and Irenæus, and which was admitted even by the Gnostics. Thus Apostolicity was the governing principle in the formation of the Canon from the beginning, and was not first borrowed from Gnostics. The latter, of course, had to appeal to "artificial chains of tradition," because they had no Apostolic Churches. In later times there was no need to make special mention of the principle, because the Church Catholic was the Church Apostolic. It was quite natural that the actual position of the Canon and the Church's judgment should then take the place of the historical principle of Apostolicity. But the latter was never forgotten. S. Augustine advises commentators to follow, in the matter of the Canonical Scriptures, the authority of the greater number of the Catholic Churches, among which some deserved to hold Apostolic Sees and to receive Apostolic letters.[41] Ven. Bede also, in his preface to the Acts of the Apostles, recalls to mind the principle of Apostolicity. We can say with justice that the Church has never claimed or used any sovereign and creative power as regards the Canon; that is rather "an "idea which is altogether at variance with the whole course "of Church history."[42] It is, therefore, a vain and hopeless task to try and derive the Canonicity of any books from the authority of the Church, or to ascribe to the

40 Harnack, *Dogmengesch.* p. 187.

41 *De doctr. christ.* II. 8, 12. See Kleutgen, *Theolog.* I. p. 61.

42 Overbeck, p. 108.

Church the power of imparting a canonical character to non canonical books by receiving them into the Canon.[43]

43 See Stapleton, *Principia fidei*, v. 9, 11. Melch. Canus, *De Locis Theol.* II. 9. R. Simon, *Histoire du T. du N.T.*, pp. 280-293.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Over and over again the writers of the Old Testament declare that God commissioned them to write down the revelations He had vouchsafed to them.[1] Between oral preaching and writing they drew no distinction whatever. The prophets delivered their revelations, and committed them to writing, as they had received them. As Revelation and inspiration are both due to the same divine influx, they are distinguished logically, but not in time. The impulse to speak and to write was coeval with the supernatural communication itself, though, in the case of the hagiographa and historical books, the case is not so transparently clear. For, since these authors found their materials ready to hand, and needed only the inspiration to commit them to writing, they were only inspired in a narrower sense of the term.[*] The 1st Book of Machabees (xii. 9) is the first to apply the epithet *holy* to the books of the Old Testament. The Jews, according to the testimony of Philo, Josephus and the Talmud, regarded their sacred books as inspired by God. "How firmly," says Josephus,[2] "we "have given credit to these books of our own nation, is "evident by what we do. For during so many ages as

1 Exod. xxxiv. 27. Deut. xiii. 19. Is. viii. 1. Jerem. xxxvi. 2.

2 *Cont. ap.* I. 8. For further quotations from Josephus and Philo, see Denzinger, *Vier Bücher*, etc., II. 169. Kihn, *Theodor von Mops.*, p. 79.

* On the distinction between Revelation and Inspiration, and its importance for the English reader, see the Preface to this volume. Tr.

"have already passed, no one hath been so bold as either "to add anything to them, to take anything from them, "or to make any change in them; but it is become natural "to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to "esteem those books to contain divine doctrines, and to "persist in them, and, if occasion be, willingly to die for "them." Philo, too, swells the chorus of witnesses when he tells the story of the miraculous inspiration of the seventy translators at Alexandria.

In the estimation of the Israelites, it is true, all old books were considered inspired, which treated of theology, or proposed religious instruction or moral edification for their aim, or recorded the history of the people under God's leadership. Philo's own writings were included in this category, and this Hellenistic view was shared by the Essenes of Palestine and the (later ?) Egyptian Therapeutæ. Canonical writings and apocrypha were alike held to be inspired. But a different kind of inspiration (*θεοπνευστία*) was allotted respectively to the prophetical and sapiential books. Prophecy and wisdom were distinct gifts. The cessation of the prophetic spirit was the ground on which Josephus limited the (22) Canonical books to the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus. Later writings, he says, were not entitled to the same faith as the earlier, because there was not a clear unbroken line of prophets. So between the inspiration of the prophetical books and that of the historical he drew a distinction. And Philo favours the same view.

All the Old Testament Scriptures without distinction are, in the New Testament, referred to as Holy Scripture. Jesus Himself refers to Moses and the prophets, without distinguishing God's word from the writer's. "It is written;" "The Scripture says;" and similar phrases clearly show that for the settlement of disputes divine truth was the supreme court of appeal. S. Paul calls the Old Testament "Holy Scripture,"* "the

* Rom. I. 2.

"Scripture,"[3] and he quotes particular sayings as the "written "word."* Hence it mattered not the breadth of a hair whether a book was quoted by name, or in general; the Pentateuch was represented by the Law and Moses, and the Old Testament generally by the Law and the prophets, or, again, the prophets stand for Isaias, and the Psalms for David. Only one direct testimony to inspiration is contained in the Gospels, viz., in Matth. xxii. 43, where Jesus says of David that he spoke "in "spirit." But S. Peter says: "No prophecy of Scripture is "made by private interpretation. For prophecy came not by "the will of man at any time; but the holy men of God spoke, "inspired by the Holy Ghost."† From this it may be argued generally that the Old Testament is inspired. This is borne out by S. Paul's words "All Scripture inspired of God is profitable "to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that "the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good "work."‡

Of its own inspiration, the New Testament naturally contains no direct proof, unless the beginning of the Apocalypse is a case in point. If I. Tim. v. 18 were a quotation of Luke,[4] it would put this gospel on a level with the Old Testament. But, as the passage contains a previous quotation from the Old Testament, there is still room for doubt. The general inspiration of the Apostles necessarily entailed the inspiration of their writings. To claim a special inspiration for these, or to urge such claim before the faithful, seemed to them superfluous. For both they and the faithful knew full well that they were the mouthpiece of the Holy Spirit, whether they preached the Gospel by word of mouth or by writing. Hence, in their prefatory addresses, they

3 Rom. iv. 3; ix. 17; x. 11. Gal. iii. 8, 22; iv. 30. Hebr. I. 6; III: 7; iv. 7 x. ;15; II Tim. III. 15. Acts I. 16; iv. 25.

4 Luke x. 7. Cornely, I. 20, 151. Holtzmann, p. 107.

* I. Cor xv. 54

† II. Peter. 1. 20.

‡ II. Tim. III. 16—Or: "All Scripture is inspired of God *and* profitable, &c.' "*And*" is wanting in the Vulgate.

lay stress on nothing but their Apostolic calling. In this lay their all-sufficient authority for all their actions. Why should it have been necessary for them to prove that they were specially inspired to write? S. Paul's occasional reference to the Spirit of God which he claims to possess, is not made for the purpose of proving that his letters were inspired, but in order to claim inspiration and divine authority for his Apostolic action generally. "I think that I also have the Spirit of God,"* he says; and he speaks of himself as one having obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful.† In the introduction of the Epistle to the Galatians he appeals to the divine origin of his Gospel. Now this Gospel was first and chiefly his oral preaching to the heathen. To no reader will it occur that the authority to write was different[6] from the authority to preach. S. Peter, too, places the Epistles of Paul on a level with "the other "Scriptures," and says that Paul "according to the wisdom "given him, hath written to you."‡ Does wisdom in writing mean anything different from wisdom in preaching? S. Paul's adversaries in Corinth said: "For his Epistles, indeed, "are weighty and strong; but his bodily presence is weak, and "his speech contemptible."§ But what does Paul answer? "Let such an one think this, that such as we are in word by "epistles, when absent, such are we also in deed when present." In the Apocalypse, where prophecy and inspiration are undeniably expressed, the word "in the Spirit"‖ refers to the vision not to the writing; but in v. 3 he is esteemed blessed who reads and hears the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written in it.

The Apostles had no object in writing but to support their

6 Franzelin, *de Traditione et Scriptura*. Romæ 1870, p. 325. Schmid, *de Inspirationis Bibliorum vi et ratione*. Brixiae 1885, p. 59.

* I. Cor. vii. 40.

† Ibid. vii. 25.

‡ II. Peter iii. 15.

§ II. Cor. x. 10.

‖ I. 9.

preaching. Writing was not an object in itself. The books of the New Testament were occasional writings, designed to supplement the spoken word and personal activity. In the case of the Epistles this needs no proof. A glance at the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians is sufficient; when the Apostle passes on to a new subject he always states the reason that prompts him to speak about it. In the Gospels and in the Acts, however, it might seem to be otherwise. But nowadays there is hardly a doubt that they also were occasioned by external circumstances, and were not intended as an exhaustive treatise. An Alexandrine writer of the 3rd century observes:[7] "The ancients neither wrote, nor cared to sacrifice preaching "and tradition to writing, nor to devote to writing the time "necessary for oral explanation. Perhaps, they were also con-"vinced that writing and teaching were different orders of gifts; "and they preferred the latter." Eusebius says that Matthew and John (in contradistinction to the other Apostles who did not write) as tradition has it, were driven by external necessity,[8] to write their Gospels. "For," says Chrysostom, "in "directing their thoughts to what was urgent, they did not "allow their zeal to evaporate in writing; for they have handed "down much that is unwritten. "Why from out the multitude "of disciples were only two Apostles, Matthew and John, and "two disciples, the one of Paul, the other of Peter, found to "write Gospels?" "Because" he answers, "their action was "dictated not by ambition but by necessity."[10] Matthew, he goes on to say, dealt only with such matters as were urgent. And he thus paraphrases the procemium of Luke's Gospel: "None of them have told everything accurately, because their "efforts lay in another direction."[11] The Greek commentators, following in the wake of their chief, accounted for the

7 See Aberle, *Einleitung*, p. 11.

8 H. E. III. 25, 5.

9 *Homil. I. in Act Ap.* cf. *in Math. Hom.* xiv. 8.

10 *Homil. in Math.* I. 2.

11 *Homil. in Act. Ap.* I. 3.

fewness of the Gospels by saying that the Apostles, flinging away ambition, employed their gifts in relieving immediate needs. Naturally, the Latins were slow to take up the question ; but a perusal of the prefaces to Jerome's and Augustine's harmony of the Gospels cannot but convince the reader that, in their eyes, the Apostolic writings were supplementary and subsidiary to their teaching. Salmeron quite caught the note sounded by tradition, when he said that Luke,[12] like the other three Evangelists, wrote not, till he was entreated and almost compelled. Not only the New Testament, as Möhler justly remarks, but even the writings of the Fathers were called into being in order to meet the exigencies of the situation created by the enemies of the faith. For, he says, the peculiar nature of the Catholic Church begets firm faith and peaceful repose and confidence.

And yet, despite the opinion that the New Testament writings were occasional papers, there was no reader, either in Apostolic times or afterwards, but regarded it as self-evident that the Apostolic writings were inspired. What else could he think on reading that their work was piloted by the Spirit of God? Saul and Barnabas were separated for the work to which they were appointed in consequence of an immediate revelation from that same Holy Spirit,* who guided and enlightened Paul in all his decisive actions. Gifts of graces were also bestowed on individual members of the community for a special purpose.† Nor can we doubt, despite the hypothetical dress in which his speech is veiled, that he is ascribing to himself, besides the gift of tongues, the gift of prophecy and a knowledge of mysteries. Inspiration is not enumerated among the gifts, even with reference to his Epistle. Why, then, should it be deemed necessary? Inspiration, strictly so called, as is gathered from a comparison of II. Tim. III. 16, with II. Peter

12 Opp. 1602, T. II. Tr. 32. cf. Calmet, *Nov. T. Proleg.*, p. 3.
* Acts xiii. 2.
† I Cor. xi. 1.

I. 21., is usually understood to mean an impulse of the Holy Spirit to write; this, however, would not prevent one and the same gift in the Apostles being used for two acts of the Apostleship which differ only in form.

Did not the Apostles hand over to the Church their writings, as inspired? Assuredly so; but without special mention of this charisma. Their Apostolate, which embraced the gifts of preaching and inspiration, was a sufficient guarantee. To say that the Fathers appealed to this traditional delivery to the Church, and not to their Apostolic origin, as the internal ground of inspiration, is incorrect. For they insist that they handed over their writings to the Church precisely because they were Apostolic writings, from which fact their sacred and inspired character followed as a matter of course. The conviction has, indeed, always been universal that no uninspired Apostolic writings exist, at least that none such were deposited with the Church. But what conclusion is to be drawn thence? Simply this, we believe; that all Apostolic writings, having been written in virtue of the Apostolic office, were inspired. "The Gospel which they preached in the Holy Spirit, who "was sent down from heaven, was in its written form equally "the work of the Holy Spirit. When the Apostle preached, he "was enlightened by the Holy Ghost; when he wrote, it was "in the Spirit (πνευματικῶς)."[14] It may, however, be conceded, "that this principle cannot with certainty, be derived *a priori* "from the inner nature of the Apostolate; but that it is "mainly known from tradition and the sense of the Church;" for, in the last instance, the Church alone can decide what has come down from the Apostles. The writings of the Apostles are none the less, on this account, "God's own peculiar work, "which he had prepared and issued by formally inspiring their "authors. Consequently, like the Old Testament, they are a "divine document of revelation,"[15] which, however, was only

14 Kleutgen, *Theol.* I. 70. Cf. Clem: Rom. xlvii. 2.

15 Scheeben, *Dogmatik*, I. 105, 108, 115. Heinrich, *Dogmatik*, I. 727. Franzelin, l.c. p. 308. Denzinger, II. 245, who always requires consciousness for inspiration.

promulgated by the action of the Apostles in distributing the documents they had written among the Churches. The Apostolic dignity alone was certainly not sufficient to make the writing inspired; this requires the Holy Spirit to lead the Apostles into all the truth and bring to their minds whatever Jesus had said to them. But this Spirit is one and the same in preacher and writer; to both he gives impulse and support. Our Lord says: "Be not thoughtful how, or what to speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what to speak;"* were his words to hold good merely before a tribunal, and not in the exercise of the Apostolic office? Nowhere in the Apostolic writings is there the slightest allusion to such a division of the Apostolic Spirit, whereas the references to genuineness, to the subscription, the writer, the carrier &c., are fairly numerous. What evidence is furnished by the Apostolic writings themselves that they were promulgated? Is there any appeal but to the Apostolic office and spirit? Why should only a few Apostles have received this gift? To the Fathers this distinction was unknown. Writing, they held, was not *per se* a function of the Apostolic office, but was prompted by external circumstances. Apostolicity is the one test, to which they steadfastly cling. Often the writers were unable to declare and hand over their writings as inspired, for the simple reason that, consciousness of inspiration not being absolutely necessary to inspiration itself, the fact of inspiration could not at times be known or declared.†

Only one instance of promulgation is alleged,—a notice of S. Jerome on the Gospel of S. Mark. He writes thus: "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, at the request of the brethren in Rome, wrote a short Gospel according to what he had heard Peter preach. When Peter heard this, he approved by his authority, and gave it to the Church to read."[16] What

16 *De vir. ill.* c. viii. Clem. Alex. ap. Euseb. H. E. vi. 14, 5. II. 15, 1.

* Matth. x. 19.

† Chr. I. Peter I. 10, 11; II. Peter I. 20.

was this but Peter's Apostolic authority? Is there a single word about inspiration? Could the subsequent approbation supply the place of Inspiration? Jerome, moreover, proceeds: "As is "recorded by Clement in the 6th Book of the Hypotyposes "and by Papias." Papias, however, makes no mention of Peter's approbation, but explains the want of order in Mark's Gospel by the fact of Mark writing from memory. Clement says that Peter neither hindered nor encouraged Mark's work. In another place, however, he relates that when Peter heard of it, and saw the good-will of the Romans, he approved it in consequence of a revelation from the Holy Spirit. But it should also be remembered that Eusebius has preserved quotations of a very different complexion from the Hypotyposes, the second of which clearly betrays a later view, and that, moreover, no promulgation whatever of the book's inspiration is even hinted at. Peter is represented as the recipient of the revelation. Now a comparison of the passage just quoted from Jerome, with his prologue to S. Matthew's Gospel, discloses the fundamental idea underlying all ancient references to this point: "Mark, who had not himself seen the Lord, relates more faith-"fully than systematically what he had heard his master "preach." There is no need to comment on the difference between this passage and that from Irenæus. On one point all antiquity is agreed: that Peter and Paul were the fountain-heads of the Gospels written by Mark and Luke. Thus, even here, the principle of Apostolicity asserts itself.

But, it will be asked, are the relations subsisting between disciples and Apostles, sufficient to account for the inspiration of the Gospels? They would seem to prove little more than that the "Reminiscences of the Apostles" (Justin), as they may be called, were historically trustworthy. Moreover, the Fathers fastened these Gospels on Peter and Paul in order to make their Apostolic origin and inspiration doubly sure. To conclude that the disciples, because they had relations with the Apostles, were inspired, is hardly satisfactory in any sense. *Non liquet* is an

answer to which none can object, least of all those who revel in starting from lean and lank suppositions. For to suppose that the Evangelists made an affidavit of inspiration, or that the Church received a special revelation on this head, is but the natural outcome of a theory to which history lends as little countenance as Scripture. Neither Evangelist lets drop the slightest hint that he was conscious of inspiration, though Luke distinctly states that he had been hard at work over historical researches. Nor, again, has any ancient document come down to us, which gives colour to the view that a communication of the kind was made to any particular Church,—for of the universal Church there could then be no question. But we need not tarry here, for there is yet another answer. The Apostles, as we know, frequently appealed to the Holy Spirit, who was also communicated to the faithful, and they exhorted the faithful to be mindful of the gifts they had received. Would the constant companions and the interpreters of the Apostles have been without these gifts? Would they not rather be marked out by the Spirit of God for special graces, as being the helpmates of the Apostles? This explains why the Romans made their request to Mark. It also throws light on that word of Luke: "It has "seemed good to me also." The conclusion is obvious. For as no one doubted that these helpmates were instructed by the Apostles and enlightened by the Spirit of God, their writings were at once accepted as Holy Scripture.

S. Chrysostom says: When I say to him (i.e. Luke), I mean to Christ," and he proves the reference thus: "That the Holy "Spirit was in him, is clear from the signs that followed; from "the fact that many had received the spirit; from the testimony "of S. Paul who declares that his praise is in the Gospel; and "from his election after the imposition of hands. . . . . "Again, as the delegate of the Churches* in the works of grace, "of which we are the ministers, he is an honour to God and an "encouragement to ourselves."[17] Whether this exegesis be cor-

17 *Hom. in Act. ap.* I. 1, 2.
* II. Cor. viii, 18.

rect or no, the passage itself is instructive, as affording a glimpse into what the Fathers, at the close of the fourth century, thought of the Gospels written by the disciples of the Apostles. Not every eye-witness, but only the constant companions whom the Apostles commissioned to give testimony, were empowered to write a Gospel; and even these required, in addition to the teaching of the Apostles, an inward call from the Holy Spirit. In this sense we may say with S. Augustine: "Christ ordered "them to write, as it were, with his own hand, all that he wished "us to read of his words and works."[18]

The connection between literary activity and the Apostolate, will enable us to see the higher economy that pervades the New Testament, without forcing us to view the composition of the writings apart from their historic circumstances. That only two out of the twelve Apostles wrote Gospels, and that only a few wrote letters, was no mere accident. Not, indeed, that the others lacked the gift of inspiration; but, by God's providence, the need of using the apostolic gift in writing did not arise in their sphere of work. Had they been invested merely with the commission to preach, any departure would have required a two-fold impulse, external and internal; otherwise further consequences would be entailed. Why, for instance, should we have been left in the dark as to the most important incidents in Jesus' life? No sufficient reason is alleged. Here again we may appeal to St. Augustine: "John spoke, because he was "inspired. Had he not been inspired he would have said "nothing; but being an inspired *man*, he said not everything, but "only such things as a man could say."[19] So the New Testament is "a work prepared by God himself," "a divine document of his revelation"; but in it also the Spirit of God has worked through natural causes, in harmony with the whole scheme of redemption. God handed over to the Apostles the books of the Old Testament ready-made, but the Apostles could

18 *De Consens. Ev.*, I. 35.
19 *In Joan. Tr.* 1, 1.

only deliver the New Testament writings to the several Churches, one at a time. As such, they were certainly the "documentary or written word of God," and not a mere synopsis of the word of God as preached by the Apostles. For both writing and preaching were the outward expression of that same Divine Spirit, who was working in the Apostles.

Time was required before the New Testament, as a collection, could take its place side by side with the Old. The Apostles recognized the Old Testament as Holy Scripture, and consecrated their recognition by use. Reason, Scripture, and the spoken word of the Lord are the three steps in the Pauline ladder of demonstration.* The received Canon makes no distinction in the Old Testament, as between part and part. Jews and Gnostics, and also several doctors of the Church, like Origen and the School of Antioch, admitted different degrees of inspiration in the Old Testament;[20] but the Fathers believed and were thoroughly persuaded that the whole was inspired. And this firm faith of theirs spread to the New Testament composed by the Apostles, when it was gradually growing into a collection. S. Ignatius extols the Gospel, because of the admirable matter it contains; to wit the advent of the redeemer, our Lord Jesus Christ, his passion and resurrection. "The beloved prophets foretold him; the "Gospel is the fulfilling of eternal life. All (i.e. "Old and New Testament) is good, if you believe it "in charity."[21] The oldest instance on record of putting the two Testaments on the same level is to be found in Barnabas iv. 14, where Matthew (xxii. 14) is cited with the biblical formula: "It is written." And this testimony becomes more weighty by being compared with the Epistles to the Philadelphians (viii. 2), which quotes the Gospel by the formula: "As it is written." Whence, it would seem that lessons from S. Matthew's Gospel, at any rate, were then read at divine service. Clement of Rome,

20 See Denzinger, II. 214.
21 *Ad. Philad.*, IX.
* I. Cor. ix. 8. 14; Rom. viii. 1.

when exhorting the faithful to do what is written, quotes passages from both Testaments in juxtaposition, as the words of the Holy Ghost.[22] Still he set greater store by the words of Jesus, of some of which on condescension and forbearance, he has given a somewhat free rendering. In like manner, Papias, prizing the spoken more highly than the written word, collected the sayings of the disciples. The 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, says Clement, was written by Paul, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. Polycarp[23] describes as Holy Scripture a passage containing Psalm iv. 5 and Ephes. iv. 26. The Gnostics who may be traced to the first century, also appealed to the New Testament.

As in the Ignatian Epistles, so also in the *Epistle to Diognetus*, the Gospels, the Apostles and Prophets, are placed side by side.[24] Justin, indeed, at times, invokes the Old Testament to prove the trustworthiness of the New; but he is taking his stand as an apologist, to whom the prophecy of the chief events in Jesus' life seemed the strongest motive of faith. For the same reason he gives the title "Holy Scripture" exclusively to the Old Testament. So far, however, from considering the preaching of the Apostles inferior to that of the prophets he recognizes in both the voice of God.[25] The story of fulfilment, he proceeds, must be told by the same Divine Spirit, who inspired the seer to foretell it. And Justin considers the Christian's insight into the Old Testament to be wholly due to Divine grace. This train of ideas was quite foreign to the Judaism of Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes. Could the sacred writers have known, without being enlightened from above, the importance that the Old Testament has for Christianity? Melito of Sardis, by classing the Law and the prophets in the Old Testament, implies acquaintance with

22 *I ad Cor.*. xiii. 1. See Denzinger, II. 178.

23 L.c. xiii. 2. Cf. xlvi. 7, 8.

24 Euseb. III. 40, 4. Cf. Clem. Recogn. II. 1, 33.

25 *Dial.* c. 119

the New.[26] Theophilus of Antioch describes the prophecies and Gospels as written by men carried away by the Spirit of God; and he places the two on the same footing. Tertullian claims for both the Old and the New Testament the same Divine impulse. Irenæus, speaking of the Holy Scriptures generally, says that they were dictated by the Word of God and His Spirit. Origen finds the fulness of the Spirit of God in Holy Scripture; in all its parts,—prophecy, law and gospel—it is the work of God. According to him it is a doctrine of the Church that Holy Scripture has the Holy Spirit for its author.[27] There is scarcely need to bring forward later testimonies, as on this point there is no dispute. On the contrary, it is contended that, with the establishment of the Catholic Church about the middle of the 2nd century, the New Testament Canon was put on a perfectly equal footing with the Old.[28]

On the *nature of inspiration*, the language of the Fathers is as sublime, as when they speak of the inspiration of the organs of revelation.[29] They even go so far as to turn the story of the wonderful origin of the Septuagint into a proof of its inspiration. Moses, and the prophets, and the Apostles were, so to speak, hands set in motion by the Holy Ghost. The Scriptures compensate for the loss of that immediate intercourse which God held with man in his original state. To men, who were no longer worthy to converse with God, God sent letters, as if they were far away. But the message, though brought by Moses, was sent by God, who set Moses' tongue in motion, and spoke by it. And that same divine power stirred the soul of John the Evangelist to its inmost depths. Thus

26 Euseb. iv. 26. Denzinger, II. 179. Hefele, *Concilieng.* I. 819. *Constit. Apost.* vi. 16.

27 *De Princip.* 1, 8.

28 See Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 283. Overbeck, *Geschichte des Canon*, p. 78.

29 Cf. Barnab. 8. Justin, *Cohort. ad Graec.* 8. *Ap.* II. 13. *Dial.* c. 52, 76. Clem. Alex., Cohort. 9. *Strom.* vi. 761. Tertull., *Apol.* xxxi. *De cultu Mul.* III. Orig., *De Princip. Proem.* (I. 156). *C. Cels.*, VII. 334. Kleutgen, *Theol.* I. 56. Schanz, *Christian Apology*, I. 337 seq. Also *Theol. Quart.* 1877, p. 636, with quotations from Chrysostom, Basil, Ambrose, Augustine. See also Weiss, *Die Kappadocier*, p. 17. Zoekler, *Beziehungen*, I. 179.

writes S. Chrysostom; and the Greeks are at one with him, in thinking that no word, or letter, or sign of the text is without deep divine instruction. But on this point Origen with justice remarks: "To interpret the same "aright, I consider a most difficult task, because the mat-"ters therein treated are so obscure."[30] The allegorical interpretation, though hardly doing justice to the Scriptures, cannot be held responsible for what is called the theory of literal inspiration; for if it were, we should not find similar views of inspiration in such strict adherents of the Antioch school as Theodore of Mopsuestia and Junilius.[31] That Ambrose and other Western Fathers, whose literary indebtedness to the Greeks was great, should re-echo their views on this point, is not surprising.

Verbal inspiration, in one form or another, has found champions in every age, even down to our own times. Bonaventure declares himself in its favour.[32] Estius applies it thoroughly and consistently,[33] when, from II. Timothy iii. 16, he concludes, the sacred and canonical Scriptures were written by the Holy Ghost in such fulness and completeness, that both the ideas and the words, and their co-ordination and arrangement were the work of God, who himself both spoke and wrote. The mild Melchior Canus[34] says, "it is the general belief, that the several parts of the Canonical books were written with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and that all parts, great or small, were set forth by the sacred writers, *dictante Spiritu Sancto.*" Commenting on the passages from the Fathers, Franzelin[35] observes that the influence and perfect truthfulness of the Holy Spirit extends to all, even the minutest details of Scripture. Even for things that are, or can be naturally

30 *C. Cels.* v. *In Math.* xvi. 12.

31 Kihn, pp. 98, 473.

32 *Breviloq. Proem.*

33 To II. Tim. III. 16.

34 *De Loc. Theol.*

35 *L.c.* pp. 294, 299. Schmid, p. 14.

known, he requires, with S. Thomas, an assistance of the Holy Spirit, and he thence argues that the signs (letters &c.) must correspond to the sense. He requires a divine efficacy which leads the writer to choose infallibly signs that are adapted to give a true and clear representation of the things and thoughts inspired. Heinrich also says: "Not only all the contents, but the entire form of Holy "Scripture, is inspired down to the last word." "The "sayings of the sacred writers are, at the same time, prin-"cipally utterances of the Holy Spirit."[36] Schätzler goes to even greater lengths. To him the very action of the writers appear but an instrument used by God to do his work. "It differs from the action of a material instru-"ment by being a living spiritual being, that is set in "motion in a manner suited to its nature."[37]

The very strict notion of inspiration held by the Reformers was necessitated by their exclusive principle, "*The Bible only.*" The Old orthodox Protestants were at great pains to prove strict verbal inspiration. The very signs in the original Hebrew text passed as the work of the Holy Spirit.[38] This unnatural, strained view necessarily drove others into the opposite extreme. The Armenians and Socinians limited inspiration to prophecy. Rationalistic Protestant theologians soon began to think that Scripture was not free from error. Full-blown rationalists threw overboard the strict notion of inspiration, and, since the latter half of last century, have further lightened their cargo by tossing out into the sea every positive notion of inspiration. The Scripture proof, which the old writers sought to establish by heaping up *dicta probantia*, was discarded as insufficient and uncertain. "For the "orthodox doctrine of inspiration, which lies at the bot-"tom of this proof, has been so pitilessly belaboured at the

36 I. 572.

37 *Introductio in s. Theol. ad ment. D. Thomae Aq.* Opus Posth. ed. cura et studio. Fr. Thomae Esser Ratisbonae 1882. See Katholik 1882, II. 426. Also, Fernandez, *Dissertatio crit. Theol. de verbali Biblior. inspirat.* Valladolid 1884. On the other side Schmid, *Zeitschr. für Kath. Theol.* 1885, p. 670.

38 See *Kirchenlexicon*, Art. '*Exegese.*' iv. 1095 seq. Denzinger, II. 216, 239. Zoeckler, *Handbuch der Theol. Wissenschaften.* Nordlingen 1884, II. 730.

"tribunal of historical criticism and modern culture, that the "idea of bolstering it up again, is not even entertained by the "most conservative."[39]

But our historical sketch is not yet full and complete. So far we have only looked at God's side—the side which gives a character to Holy Scripture, and which had a fascination for Christians, and indeed for all the ancients who revered the Scriptures. Nevertheless, it would be a grave mistake to suppose that the Fathers, with their unbounded reverence for Holy Scripture, allowed no play to the human element. Rather they were convinced that the writers, under the enlightenment and guidance of the Holy Spirit, accommodated themselves to circumstances, and to the capacity of their readers. They could not shut their eyes to the fact, so clear, so shining, and so evident, that the different writers have different styles, and follow different plans. Their habit, too, borrowed from the New Testament writers, of quoting from memory, without scrupulous regard to the wording, shewed that they favoured this liberal view. Indeed, when the literal sense was handicapped with difficulty, they quietly shelved it. The Alexandrine School, which was the first to enunciate the view of a relatively complete inspiration, found in allegory a ready wedge for riving hard knots, and for explaining away, when necessary, the historical element in the narrative. Types served the same purpose in the School of Antioch. The parallel accounts in the Gospels also afforded special opportunities for studying the human side of Holy Scripture more closely. Origen strives might and main to bring them into harmony. But, at times, he is so hard pressed in trying to save the infallibility of Scripture that he can find no escape from the dilemma, except by assuming, either that the narratives refer to different events, or that a mystical sense splits the difference. This former method is still much in vogue, but no gain ever accrues therefrom to the Gospels. Similar difficulties, with which the Fathers also grap-

39 Moore, *Theol. Literaturztg.* 1887, Nr. 13 Col. 307.

pled, may be detected in the *Acts of the Apostles*, both when taken alone and when set side by side with St. Paul's Epistles.

Neither the one explanation nor the other will adequately account for the glaring discrepancies. On the theory of verbal inspiration we should expect to find always the same wording, and only one Gospel; or if, for other reasons, several Gospels had to be written, that all those differences, which, from the time of Celsus, have provided a staple argument against inspiration, would have been avoided. Moreover, we should expect Holy Scripture to contain all things necessary. "What Holy Scripture says not, it denies," says Tertullian.[41] The many passages in which the Fathers extol the *perfectio* and *plenitudo* of Holy Scripture set out from the same supposition. Thus S. Athanasius relates that the Council of Nicæa was most unwilling to insert the term ὁμοούσιος into the Creed, because it was not in Scripture. Nothing but the impossibility of finding a Scriptural term to crush the heresy overcame their scruples. "Believe what is written; never "mind what is not written," says Basil. "For if there is a "dispute on a very obscure subject, and no clear and cer-"tain testimonies are at hand from Holy Scripture, man's "arrogance must halt, and not incline to one side."[42] And S. Thomas quotes Pseudo-Dionysius as objecting: we must not dare to give out as coming from God aught but what is expressed in Holy Scripture;[43] and in his answer, and elsewhere he tones down the sentence by adding: "Either in word or according to sense." Here also he follows Dionysius, who defended the ὁμοούσιος in this way.

The Fathers and Theologians, however, drew none of these conclusions from the doctrine of verbal inspiration, and thus they left the door open for another view. In their eyes the fulness and completeness they ascribed to Scripture applied to the demonstration, not to the source

41 *De Monog.* 4.
42 *De Peccator. Merit.* II. 36.
43 S. Thom, I. Q. xxxii. a. 2 ad 1. Cf. xxix. a. 3 ad 1.

of faith. "We use these books (Gospels) when we have "to argue with heretics about the faith of the Gospel," says Tertullian. "When it is a question," says Pseudo-Origen, "of demonstrating the faith to those who are out-"side the Church, oral tradition does not suffice; for as "these reject hearsay evidence, the written document is "the only substitute for ocular testimony." And Chrysostom says: "For as the Apostolic writings are the "Church's bulwarks, the Church safeguards both those "which then existed, and those which came into existence "later."[44] Pseudo-Athanasius, in proof of this, instances S. Paul who, although he had Christ speaking within him, did not throw his single authority into the scale without the testimony of Holy Scripture. All that is written about God should be compared with the sayings of Scripture and tested by the rule of faith.

But now the tables began to be turned, and the very differences in the Scripture were adduced in proof of their trustworthiness. "What!" asks S. Chrysostom, "could "not one Evangelist have written all? Certainly. But "as four writers, living at different times and places, and "without conferring with one another, speak, as it were, "with one mouth, the proof that they spoke the truth is "overwhelming. But the precise contrary happened, says "some one; for they are convicted of contradicting one "another. And this is precisely the strongest point in the "armoury of truth. For if everything tallied exactly as "to time, place and language, every objector would be-"lieve that there had been collusion. For, he would say, "this agreement is wanting in straightforwardness. But "now the apparent contradiction wipes away the faintest "trace of suspicion, and is a brilliant testimony to the "character of the writers."[45] On this passage Bleek remarks: "Still the orthodox teachers, whether on the

44 Tertull., *Adv. Marc.* iv. 5. Pseudo-Origines, *de recta fide in Deum*, I. Chrysost., *Homil. in* "hoc autem scitote," II. Tim. iii. 1. Aug., *in Joan.* Tr. xxvi. 15; xxx. 1. Cyrill. Hieros., *Catech.* v. 12. See Aberle-Schanz, p. 12. Reithmayer, *Einleitung in das* N. T. 1854, pp. 106–117.

45 *In Math. Homil.* 1 2.

"Catholic or Protestant side, who concede thus much, are "few."[46] But, on the Catholic side, there are more than he imagines. In the case of the Greeks, with whom the opinion of Chrysostom is paramount, this is clear from the prologues to the commentaries of Euthymius and Zigabenus. But even Western writers have adopted this view. Chrysostom's position is taken up by S. Thomas in the Preface to the *Catena Aurea*, by Jansen in his Tetrateuch, by Cornelius a Lapide in the Preface to the Gospels, by R. Simon, Hug, Feilmoser, Wilke, Alzog, Schegg, Hettinger, Aberle, Schanz, &c. But it is alike contrary to this view and to fact, to represent the differences named as a consequence of inspiration, as if the divine truths contained therein were thus lit up all the more perfectly and from different sides! This might be said of the whole, not of the several particular instances.

Chrysostom not merely broached this principle speculatively, but he also practically applied it in his commentaries. True, in carrying it out, he was not slow to perceive that his principle was a two-edged sword; nor did he wish to give undue prominence to the biblical discrepancies; nevertheless he held fast to the principle that in these side issues there need be no anxiety about inspiration. Thus, respecting the differences between the two accounts given by Matthew and Luke, of the ruler of Capharnaum, he says that the whole question turns on the point, whether the two Evangelists represent the ruler as animated by a lively faith in the greatness of the Redeemer's power. This is the standpoint adopted in most commentaries of the Fathers, conspicuously so in the case of S. Augustine, who discusses the principle involved in the question. In his work on the Gospels he puts forward two views of inspiration, so sharply antagonistic, that at first blush one suspects a contradiction lurking within. So much stress is laid on the divine influence, that human action seems almost effaced; on the other hand, the scope allowed to man's

46 *Synoptische Erklärung*, 1862, I. 14.

work is so wide, that we find ourselves on the borderland of inspiration. But S. Augustine pursues the same method both in this question, and in the question of grace and freewill. He is convinced that the sacred authors wrote as "*membra Christi*, "*dictante capite*";[48] but the sole reason of the various discrepancies, he says, lies in the action of the writers; and this he allows to have been influenced by the scope and tendency of their writings. What is this, but asserting in principle the presence of a human element? For the rest, as Augustine knew, not all unimportant details and minor differences of style can be thus accounted for. Hence he concludes that one thing, and one only is certain, and stands out as a rock against the chiding flood: that Scripture is free from error. Less cannot be expected of an inspired book. A book purely human cannot be free from error; a book inspired by the Holy Ghost cannot contain error. "But I have learnt to hold the books of the "Canonical Scriptures in such reverence and high esteem, that "I firmly believe that no one of their authors has fallen into "any error."[49] "If any one affirms that the Evangelists ought "to have had that power imparted to them by the Holy Spirit, "which would insure them against all variations in the kind, or "arrangement or number of words, that person fails to "perceive, that just in proportion as the authority of the "Evangelists is made pre-eminent, the credit of all other men "who offer true statements of events, ought to have been "established on a stronger basis by their instrumentality. For "seeing how different witnesses may tell the same story, and "deviate from one another in certain particulars, without being "justly impeached for untruthfulness, they also are emboldened "to tell the truth, being able to point to precedents set them by the Evangelists."[50]

48 *De Cons. Evv.* I. 34. Cf. I. 7. Quoted also by S. Thomas, *Caten. Aur. in Math. Praef.* Cf. *Confess.* xii. 14 (al. xx. 23). *De civ. Dei*, xviii. 41. See also Kaulen, *Einleitung*, p 14, and Aberle-Schanz, *Einleit.* p. 14.

49 Ep. 82, 3a ad Hier. See Confess. xii. 18.

50 *De Cons. Evv.* II. 28.

These passages might be indefinitely multiplied. In both Greek and Latin writers many such may be found, which are literally almost self-contradictory.[51] On the one hand, the sacred writers are represented as members of Christ, and mere instruments of the Holy Spirit; on the other, they are fully conscious of their duty and their purpose, and execute it in a manner corresponding to their education and attainments. In each case the matter is supplied; but the language, in which it is clothed, the treatment, and the arrangement are left to the writer's taste and judgment. The explanation of this fact, surprising in itself, is simple. The working of the gifts of the Holy Spirit was still fresh in the minds of the apologists; the impression produced on them by heathen ideas of divination had not been obliterated; they took their stand mainly on prophecy; they look at the objective fact, without examining it in its subjective aspect. The power of the Holy Spirit, which was urged as a proof of the divinity of Christianity, was comparatively so overwhelming, that the idea of man's action, even in the written word, was thrust into the background. Only when heretics carried the war into the territory of Scripture, did men begin to study deeply the manner of its origin. The direct attacks made by the heathens on both the Old and New Testaments, compelled the Fathers to look to their defences, and to erect a scientific frontier on the human side. And thus, the later Fathers, while couching their view of inspiration in the same language, were by no means disposed to admit verbal inspiration. From their theory, their faith in the divine origin of Scripture is seen to be an oak that was not to be wind-shaken; but the manner in which they applied the theory betokened a concession to the circumstances of the hour. Now, taking our stand on them, and arguing backwards, we should say that the somewhat overstrained phrases used by the apologists ought not to be pressed too closely. Thus, their "tools of the Holy Spirit" should not be understood to mean irrational and mechanical tools. Had

51 Denzinger II. 238.

they drawn a sharper distinction between revelation and inspiration, they would have been compelled to explain their view more fully and accurately. And this gives more cogency to the contention that the expression *dictare* (which often means to order) should not, in the mouth of the Fathers, be made synonymous with verbal inspiration. Of its use among them several instances may be appropriately given. Thus, S. Gregory the Great uses the phrase,[52] and yet in his homilies, he pays homage to the principles of S. Augustine. Nay, he receives Canon 41 as he receives the Gospels.[53] Of the decrees of Chalcedon Leo the Great says: to this rule, which came of divine inspiration nothing can be added. Augustine says that Jerome writes "*non tantum donante, verum etiam dictante spiritu.*" In the Bull confirming the Council of Trent, Pius IV. declares that the Fathers of Trent were "*divinitus inspirati.*" So we may say, at least, that the Fathers did "not use these expressions in the strictest sense, as though "every passage of Scripture had been verbally inspired by the "Holy Ghost."

Post-tridentine Theologians, while adopting the language of the Fathers in laying special stress on *dictare*, also followed *in practice* their mild interpretation. The commentary of the elder Jansenius is an instance in point. Very often it reminds the reader of S. Augustine's Concordance; but the critical progress is unmistakable. Again, Salmeron, a Lapide, Calmet especially, and many others[54] shew an inclination to the milder view. The proposition laid down by Suarez sounds harsh, and grates on the ear: "Scripture was written by the operation of "the Holy Spirit, who dictated not the sense only, but also the "words." Now read the explanation. This operation, he says, can be understood to mean two things: either a special previous movement, or merely assistance and protection! If the Canonical author is writing something which is in itself human, and falls

52 *In Job Praef.* Cf. Theodoret. *in Ps. Praef.* Kleutgen. l.c. I. 57.

53 *Ep.* 120. Leo, *Ep.* 115 (al. 73). Aug., *Ep.* 82, 1, 2.

54 Denzinger, II. 241.

within the domain of the senses, it seems sufficient, he says, for the Holy Spirit to give him special assistance by keeping him from error and falsehood, and by preventing him from using unsuitable words. The same view is expressed by Melchior Canus: After "*dictante Spiritu*," he adds: "I allow that all the parts of Scripture did not need "a special and express revelation; I merely contend that "they severally proceeded from a special impulse of the "Holy Spirit."[55] *

But what about modern theologians, and their strict notions of inspiration? The number of limitations, modifications and exceptions with which they hedge in their theory, shows how little it accords with their practice. The road by which they travel, as he who tries to trudge it will find, abounds in crooked windings. Thus, for instance, it is conceded that the writers of the Hagiographa had pretty free scope for their action. For, we are told, that in matters which must have come under their own knowledge, it was sufficient "for the Holy Spirit to safe-"guard, enlighten and direct their mental activity in such "a way, that their utterances were, at the same time and "principally, the utterances of the Holy Spirit."[56] But in purely historical matters which the writers learnt by their own experience or research, it will be most difficult to explain *principaliter* satisfactorily, seeing that it implies merely an order, not of time, but of nature. The explanation will be more satisfactory if we first read the defence in answer to the charge, brought against not only Dupin, Chrismann, Canus, Calmet, and Stattler, but also against Bellard and A Lapide, of having taught that, in many parts of Scripture, especially in the Hagiographa, the action of the Holy Spirit consisted merely in impelling the sacred authors to write, and in preserving them from error. With the "clear passage" of A Lapide on II. Tim. III. 16, we are fully in accord. After remarking that it is noteworthy

55 *De Loc. Theol.* II. 17; xviii. 1. Suarez, *de fide* Disp. v. Sect. 3, n. 3. 5.
56 Heinrich I. 724; but see also I. 721 Note.
* John xiv. 26.

that the Holy Spirit did not dictate all the Scriptures in the same way, he adds: "observe the explanation of this "expression, which is in general use among the ancients, "and with which they are so often unjustly reproached by "the moderns."[57] He thus continues: for the Law and the Prophets God dictated to Moses and the prophets word for word; but the histories and moral exhortations, which the writers of the Hagiographa had themselves seen or heard or read, need not have been inspired or dictated by the Holy Spirit, for the writers themselves were already acquainted with them.* We may say, however, that the Holy Spirit dictated to them, firstly by preserving them from going astray from the truth in any point, secondly by moving them, and suggesting to them to write one thing rather than another; thirdly by arranging, distributing and guiding all their thoughts and sentences.[58] Hence, A Lapide and the members of his order at Louvain won the admiration of St. Simon, who also distinguished between prophetic and other inspiration, and laid special stress on freedom from error.

Others[59] carried the process of modifying the notion of inspiration still further, by referring the arrangement, the choice of words, and the like, whether in the prophetical or other writings, to the simple assistance of the Holy Ghost. Thence they gather that the *dictatio verborum* is neither an essential element in inspiration, nor a consequence of God's authorship. God, they say, enlightened, moved and assisted the writers to find out for themselves, in a manner suited to their different dispositions and education, signs that would express the inspired ideas. This is more like the modern usage of the word, according to which the thought and drift, rather than the words of a book or article, are said to be inspired. But even in Holy Scripture, inspiration does not mean a complete sugges-

57 Heinrich I. 723 Note. Kleutgen I. 62. Denzinger II. 235.
58 See argum. in Matth. R. Simon, *Histoire*, etc., p. 280.
59 Franzelin, l.c. p. 302. Also, Perrone and Hettinger and others.
* John xix. 35; Luke i. 2.

tion or dictation of words, but rather an *afflatus* and *influxus* of the Spirit; an action of God that moves the inner man, and holds him in its hand.[60] This will sufficiently cover the three elements deemed indispensable to the strict notion of inspiration;[61] the impulse to write, the suggestion or recalling to memory of thoughts, and immunity from error.

The reasons for thus limiting the notion of inspiration are sufficiently indicated in the historical development of the concept itself. These reasons may be classified as direct and indirect. The positive reasons lie in the fact, not infrequent in the historical books, that the writers positively name the sources from which they have drawn their information. Perhaps it will occur to some one to consider these sources as sacred books. But this view is untenable, as we distinctly learn from the Sacred Book of Machabees.*

The writer declares it to be merely his purpose to abridge into one book such things as have been handed down by Jason of Cyrene in five books. "We have taken care for "those indeed that are willing to read, that it might be a "pleasure of mind; and for the studious that they may "more easily commit to memory; and that all that read "might receive profit. And as to ourselves indeed in un-"dertaking this work of abridging, we have taken in hand "no easy task, yea rather a business full of watching and "sweat." But he will not be answerable for details. "For to collect all that is to be known, to put the "discourse in order, and curiously to discuss every "particular point, is the duty of the author of a "history, but to pursue brevity of speech, and to avoid "nice declarations of things, is to be granted to him "that maketh an abridgment.† In conclusion he says: "Which if I have done well, and as becometh the

60 Scheeben, I. 115.
61 Heinrich I. 752. Denzinger II. 223. Kilber, *de princip. theol.* disp. I. c. 1. a. 3. n. 13 (Theol. Wirceberg.)
* II. Machab. ii. 25–27; xv. 39.
† Ib. 30. 31.

history, it is what I desired: but if not so perfectly it must be pardoned me."* In the New Testament, again, the prologue to S. Luke's Gospel shows how comprehensive was the author's own action.[63]

Whether he purposely omitted all mention of inspiration, or whether he was unconscious of the same, it is difficult to decide. As a disciple of S. Paul he must have had a general acquaintance with the workings of the Spirit. In any case it is clear that inspiration in the sense of a formal address or speech, did not here exist; nor was it regarded as an indispensable element. Nor can we lay down, as a principle, the impossibility of unconscious inspiration.

Among the indirect reasons may be reckoned differences of what is usually called style, and the disposition and arrangement of the whole; and we may add that, even the way of viewing the same things, great and small, is often very different. Some passages are at times quoted in different senses. Historical events are regarded under different points of view, as may be seen from the Chronicles in the Old Testament and from the Gospels and Acts in the New. Compare, again, the account of the Synoptists with that in S. John's Gospel, and the Epistle to the Romans with the Epistle of S. James. The same light is, without detriment, broken up into different colours by the prism of the individual, as the light of the Holy Spirit shines thereon.

The numbers given in the Old Testament, besides being at times critically unreliable, are too general, and too often round numbers. In the speech of Stephen there are several inaccuracies. Although we may explain these things from the scope of the writer, without giving up, like almost all Protestant theologians,[64] Scripture's "freedom from error in natural things,"

63 Bretschneider quotes John xix. 35. Luke I. 1. I Cor. vii. 12; x. 15. Gal. II. 6. I Thess. v. 20, 21. II Thess. II. 2. See also I John iv. 1. Deut. xxx. 11-14. Prov. iv. 3 seq. Luke I. 3. I Cor. vii. 10, 25. II Cor. xi. 7. seq. See Denzinger, I. 164.

64 Hofman, *Hermeneutik*, 1880, p. 82.

* Ibid xv. 39.

still they show that inspiration gave a wide scope to the inspired writers. Round instead of exact numbers, contractions and expansions, spiritual and moral applications are allowed to pass and we take them as a matter of course in all writings. The Apostles permitted themselves such freedom in regard to the Old Testament.[65] Should they have treated traditional matter differently? Were the writers of Old Testament more reserved? Inspiration is not affected if a story is told with a local colouring, or toned down to suit the age, or with due regard to the sources of information, and the end in view. S. Paul was not ashamed to quote heathen poets; Jude used even the Apocrypha. Origen, and Augustine, too, wanted to explain figuratively everything not appertaining to faith and morals.[66] Many profoundly Catholic writers are now accustomed to hold a wider view of inspiration, so as not to comprise "*obiter dicta*" i.e. casual side remarks that do not bear on faith and morals.[67]

In this way Cardinal Newman meets the objection, that Catholics are bound to believe assertions in the Bible, that are said to be utterly discredited by modern science and historical criticism. The doctrine of the Church, which they are bound to believe, he argues, extends to two points: the authority, and the interpretation of Scripture. In all matters of faith and morals Holy Scripture is inspired. Purely natural matters cannot be of faith. Faith and morals are the limitations set by the Councils of Trent and the Vatican. For all the rest, natural influences are to be admitted. The historical narrative, of course, is part of the whole, because providence and the economy of the Gospel is everywhere revealed therein. This intimate relation of history to God's supernatural providence is precisely what is unknowable to the mere historian, whether

65 Origen, *in Rom.*, viii. 7. Denzinger, II. 235.
66 *De doctr. Christ.* III. 10, 14.
67 Newman, *The Nineteenth Century*, Febr. 1884. Against, Brucker, *Controverse* 1884, Decemb. p. 529. Jan. 1885, p. 117. Corluy, *Contrav.* Mai. 1885, p. 52. Schmid, *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theol.* 1886, p. 184.

ancient or modern. But God makes it known to the inspired writer. Hence Biblical history is truly *de fide*, and Scripture is inspired, not merely in faith and morals, but in all parts, facts included, that bear on faith and morals. On this score, the apologists need not be too anxious. Even the opponents of Newman, of Lenormant and Clifford allow that their view is not censurable. The editor of a French review writes in this strain : "We cannot disguise from ourselves that the new opinion which limits "inspiration and freedom from error merely to those passages of Scripture which concern faith and morals, has "lately made rapid strides. Even in many French seminaries it is taught as a probable opinion, and the conclusion is drawn that the historical books e.g. Kings, "Paralipomenon, Judges, &c., may be inspired and free "from error only in their dogmatic and moral parts ! In "this case we shall soon have to suppress two-thirds of "the Bible."[68]

I should not draw these consequences, neither would I advocate the other extreme. To say, in theory, that everything, including history, natural science, geography[69] and the like, is connected with faith and morals, is very easy, and may even be carried out in practice, if the distinction between the direct teaching of faith and morals and things indirectly bearing on them be accepted, and if, consequently, it be admitted that there are degrees of inspiration. The Councils of Trent (4 times) and the Vatican make this distinction, saying : "In matters of faith and "morals, which serve to build up Christian doctrine ;" but does it follow that everything in Holy Scripture appertains thereunto ? If so, what is the good of the distinction ? of what use are the different directions given for explaining the one and the other respectively ? The addition in both Councils, which simply establishes the connection between faith and morals, is a limitation not an enlargement. Nor is

68 *Controv.* 1886, Mars. See Girodon I. 60.

69 Heinrich, I. 729. Scheeben, I. 112. Denzinger, II. 820.

the distinction destroyed by what the Vatican Council declares about Faith.

"All those things are to be believed with divine and "Catholic faith, which are contained in the Word of God, "written or handed down, and which the Church, either "by a solemn judgment, or by the ordinary and universal "magisterium, proposes for belief as having been divinely "revealed."

For this definition only applies to Holy Scripture as such, and therefore presupposes the above definition of inspiration. All, then, that is required in this matter, so it seems to us, is, that the true state of the question be accurately defined. We have not the remotest intention of saying, that the inspired writers have erred, or were liable to err in things even unimportant and accidental; but only, that in such matters as profane science and profane history, they leave the responsibility of borrowed statements to the sources whence they drew them, or that they followed a common and well-recognized way of thinking and speaking. If any one should here think it is his duty to protest against the supposition that God could have been even the occasion of an erroneous chronology,[70] his contention would only show a mistaken notion of inspiration. On the other hand, to say that God did not correct such statements because of their unimportance, is simply to repeat what we have, in less artificial language, been saying. In those books which embody traditional and historical matter, inspiration cannot be taken in the same strict sense as in the other books. The scope and purpose of the writer are paramount. This purpose is religious, and none other; and it is as fully attained in the more liberal as in the more rigid hypothesis.

To decide in the concrete, what is essential and what accidental, what appertains to faith and what not, is, as will be readily allowed, not an easy task. Form and matter, text and context, statement and scope are so blended together that they

70 Schmid, *Inspir.* p. 76.

are not always easily separated. As a rule, extreme caution is imperative. None but the certain results of science can induce the commentator to swerve from the received interpretation of passages not bearing on faith and morals. For this reason, Theology is very slow to admit any decision on the part of science, though it is allowed more readily now than in former times. For the researches of precise historical studies and exact science are of recent origin. In these days none but biassed commentators will attempt the Sisyphean task of explaining, for example, the Scripture passages regarding the system of the universe in a geocentric or even in an heliocentric sense, so as to justify them in the eyes of science. In these matters, as the Holy Father remarks in His Encyclical, not even S. Thomas can pass, at this day, for an absolute authority.[71] What we can and must do, is to apply S. Thomas' principles, which lay down that, in what is directly of faith and what is primarily revealed by God, (e.g. the Trinity, Incarnation and such like) no one may hold a false opinion without incurring the guilt of heresy. But to faith indirectly belong all things, which, if denied, would tell against faith; e.g. if it were said that Samuel was not the son of Helcana; for, from this, it would follow that Holy Scripture is false. So, in regard to such-like matters, any one may hold a false opinion without being in danger of heresy, until it is clear, or defined that something contrary to faith would ensue, especially if he be not obstinate in his opinion. But, he says, after it has become clear, and especially after the Church has given a decision that something contrary to faith would result, it would be an error not without heresy.

Bellarmine has made a similar declaration in his well-known letter to Foscarini.[72] He distinguishes between articles of faith *ex parte objecti* and *ex parte dicentis*. To the former belongs e.g. our Lord's birth of a virgin. "But he, for instance, who would

71 S. Thom. I. Q. xxxii. a 4. See I Cor. xi. lect. 4. In lib. II. Sent. D. xii. a. 2. II. II. Q. I. a. 6 ad 1. See Scheeben, l.c. and Kleutgen, I. 69.

72 Schanz, Christian Apology I. 347.

"deny that Abraham had two, and Jacob twelve sons, "would, indeed, stumble against something that the Holy "Spirit spoke by the mouth of the inspired writer, and "which is so far matter of faith, but he would not contra-"dict any defined article of faith." Still, naturally, he does not intend to leave the other department a prey to caprice. He would regard both the one and the other as heretics; for the Holy Spirit spoke both one thing and the other by the mouth of the prophets and Apostles. The old theologians were especially fond of instancing the dog of Tobias;[73] others refer to the cloak which the Apostle left behind at Troas.*

But with these trifles, so remotely connected with faith, we are not now concerned; rather it is a question of the more important subjects of history and science. In these Bellarmine allows that exegesis must necessarily vary, when the opposite view has been scientifically established beyond all doubt, with a certainty that cannot be gainsaid. Nor do we ask for more; although the question, when viewed from the standpoint of modern requirements, has assumed a different shape. With regard, however, to S. Stephen's speech, we are substantially in agreement with Jerome and Melchior Canus. The former says that the Apostles and disciples, when addressing the people, always employed familiar texts (LXX.). The latter, following Bede and Rhabanus, says that Stephen in v. 16 of his speech, mixed up two stories. His memory being at fault, he strung together a number of details, which were, however, of little or no importance. Luke, however, wishing to be historically accurate, changed not a word, but told the story exactly as it was related by Stephen. For only Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists are quite free from error.[74]

On the application of these principles to scientific subjects we have already spoken. The only debatable point is,

73 Hieron. *ad Philem.* Prol. M. Canus, *de Locis*, II. 16.
74 Hieron. *in Genes*, c. 46. M. Canus, II. 18.
* II. Tim. iv. 13

whether there are any results of science so certain, that exegesis is bound to take them into account. Certainly there are not many such, still it would be foolish to ignore all. The Copernican system is firmly established. The main points of geology are certain, so that an explanation of the Hexæmeron and the Flood must take cognizance of them. For the rest, we can say with S. Augustine, who prized natural science highly: "What learned men can prove in science, is also "in Holy Scripture; what they maintain in opposition to "Scripture is false."[75] On the whole, and in many particulars, scientific and archæological researches have added worth and lustre to the Bible. The pictures of the creation, conservation, and end of the world, which it has sketched in bold, broad outline, are worthy of the supernatural origin of Scripture. No document of antiquity can compare with the Biblical narrative, even on these points, in grandeur of expression and depth of thought. This is strong internal evidence for the Inspiration of all Scripture, in the light of which its accommodation to the capacity of the reader pales, and almost fades out of sight.

And now we will briefly summarize this wide discussion. Inspiration is a positive action of God on the sacred writers, extending to all the parts of their books. It is positive, inasmuch as it is founded on the will of God to communicate the divine truths of religion to man; and it manifests itself by impelling the human will to commit these truths to writing, and in the support it gives to man's understanding in the act of writing. This support consists negatively, in preserving him from error, positively in communicating the truths to be made known. Hand in hand with this go the preparations of divine providence, which outwardly occasioned the books to be written according to God's will. As regards the *extent* of inspiration we must hold that all Scripture contains the word of God; but not all the parts in an equally immediate manner.

75 *Genes. ad lit.* I. 21, 41.

For all parts, however, the least claim that can be urged is freedom from error, which can be due only to God's assistance and influence.

This is the sum and substance of the Church's decisions on the Inspiration of Scripture. In the decree issued to the Jacobites at the Council of Florence, Eugenius IV. declares that the Roman Church acknowledges one and the same God to be the author of the Old and New Testaments, i.e. of the Law, the Prophets and the Gospel, because the holy men of both Testaments spoke by the inspiration of the same Holy Spirit (*Spiritu Sancto inspirante*). The Council of Trent in its 4th session teaches: "And seeing clearly that this truth (of faith) and discipline (morals) are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating (*Spiritu S. dictante*), have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand; we, following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receive and venerate with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved by the Catholic Church by a continuous succession." Concerning the *extent* of the Canon, the Synod enacted: "But if any one receives not as sacred and canonical, the said books entire with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition . . . . let him be anathema."* The Vatican Council accepts the definition of Trent on the sources of faith, but to the last definition on the Canon it adds: "These the Church holds to be sacred and canonical, "not because, having been carefully composed by mere "human industry, they were afterwards approved by

* From Waterworth's Translation.

"her authority, nor merely because they contain revela-"tion without any admixture of error, but because having "been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost they "have God for their author, and have been delivered as "such to the Church herself." And it makes a corresponding addition to the Canon of the Council of Trent: "or shall deny that they have been divinely inspired."[76]

Common to all these decisions is the doctrine that God is the author of the whole Scripture, and of all its parts. This has reference in the first place to the equality of Protocanonical and Deuterocanonical books. By the *several parts* we are to understand certain parts to which objections were made on critical grounds, and which the Council of Trent wanted at first to make the object of a special enquiry. So, for instance, from the New Testament the conclusion of S. Mark's Gospel* the pericope of the adulteress,† and the verse of S. John,‡ and perhaps also part of S. Luke.§ The verse presents special difficulty. For as it is missing, not merely in all the old codices and in the Fathers, but also in all the Vulgate codices till 800 A.D.; it does not necessarily come under the decree of the Council of Trent.[77]

The addition of the Vatican Council is a closer explanation of the Council of Trent. It is directed against those who wished to derive the Canonical character of certain books from the approbation of the Holy Spirit or of the Church,‖ or discussed the probability of such canonization e.g. in the 2nd Book of Machabees;[78]** or who considered freedom from error alone, without

76 Sess. III. Cap. II. Can. 4. See also the *symbolum Fidei* of Leo IX and Clement IV, in Denzinger's *Enchir.* 296, 386.

77 See Aberle-Schanz, p. 112. Kaulen, *Einleitung*, p. 35. Cornely, III. 670.

78 See Kleutgen, I. 61. Denzinger, II. 224. For a defence of Lessius by Kleutgen, see Schneeman. *Controversiarum de div. gr.* etc. Freiburg 1881, p. 465 seq. See also Kaulen, *Einleitg.* p. 14.

* xvi. 9–20.

† John viii. 1–11.

‡ I. John v. 7.

§ xxii. 43, 39.

‖ Chrismann, Bonfrére, Frassen, Jahn, &c., and partly Calmet.

** Hamel, Lessius.

positive action a sufficient test of Canonicity.* The Vatican Council explains the "Spiritu Sancto dictante" of the Council of Trent positively by "inspirante"—a term already used by the Council of Florence. As no philological or historical reasons would justify us in saying that the Council intended to intensify the term, we must suppose that the wider sense of the word "*dictante*" is tacitly approved. The further addition: "And as such were handed "to the Church" ("ut tales ipsi ecclesiæ traditi") is clear from the context. It is the antithesis to the opinion that the Church by subsequent approbation could make a book canonical (inspired). Scripture must be inspired when the Church receives it; it cannot become so subsequently. But it lay outside the scope of the Council, to determine *how* we are to conceive the inspiration in the Apostolic authors. Again the Vatican explanation does not determine by what way or criterium the Church came to know the inspiration of the several books. But it is certain that the Church guided by the Holy Spirit cannot err in this respect. Among Catholics the almost universally received notion of inspiration is that God is the chief author (*auctor principalis*), and that the writers are the instrumental though rational authors (*auctores instrumentales*).

* Colenso, R. Simon, Calmet, Dupin, Jahn, Janssen.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

Every book needs an interpreter, and the most competent interpreter of his own work is the author. The more ancient the book; the more remote the place in which it first saw the light; the more foreign the ideas, and the language in which the ideas are unrobed, the greater grows the need of an interpreter to throw light on the thoughts and ideas, and to set forth the author's meaning. Who would have the hardihood to interpret the canonical books of the Hindus, Chinese, Persians, or Mohammedans, unless he had thoroughly mastered the language, and made himself acquainted with the history and geography? Who, again, could understand them without note or comment? The ancient priesthoods were a special caste, whose special business it was to expound the sacred documents. Could anybody understand or obtain an insight into the great masterpieces of the Greek and Latin classics without a good education? And even with the most copious aid, how much remains obscure! To this day the students of Plato are wrangling over the true sense of their master's words.

And shall it be otherwise with Holy Scripture? Its peculiar Oriental ideas find no echo in our own; the idiom is strange, and strange also is the manner in which it adapts itself to the time spirit. And is not the need of an interpreter increased

fourfold, when it claims to be inspired by God, and to be the infallible standard of faith and conduct? The Jews, though standing in living contact with the traditional language, established schools for expounding the Scriptures. Says Rabbi Bechai: "The written Thorah is founded on the oral, and can- "not be understood without it."[1] This then is so obvious that it will glimmer through a blind man's eye; and it grows in clearness when the supernatural origin of Scripture looms on the horizon. For how can the natural man apprehend things supernatural, coming down from the Spirit of God? Holy Scripture is the "word of God," but His word in a human garb, attired in human language; impregnated with the views of the sacred writers; adapted to circumstances, and to the capacity of the reader.

Still, it may be asked, is not Holy Scripture self-interpreting? Is it not its own key? The question is not so paradoxical as it sounds. We explain the earlier works of an author by his later ones, because we know that his earlier views and opinions may have been tacitly or expressly revoked or corrected by his better and maturer judgments. S. Augustine, judged solely by his early treatises, would give but a feeble, one-sided portrait of the doctor of grace. To put S. Thomas on trial, and give the verdict, not on the ground of the *Summa Theologica* but of his commentary on the Sentences, would be unfair. But how can this principle be applied to Holy Scripture? Does not Scripture, from first to last, bear the same stamp? Is it not the work of the same Spirit? Most certainly; but it has a human side as well as a divine, and it is unmistakably progressive in character. It is a divine revelation, ever gradually pressing forward to its full and final development. The later books, therefore, must needs light up the earlier. And since the Old Testament was a preparation for the New, it must be legible and intelligible when the full blaze of light from the New Testament is turned on it. "The Old Testament," to quote again S. Augustine's saying,

1 Cf. Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*. Basil, 1861, p. 67. *Theol. Quartal.* p. 22: Note 1.

"lies open in the New." The New Testament contains many passages from the Old, and so explains their meaning. And again, what is much more important, the *spirit* of the New Testament is the key wherewith to unlock the Old, and to lay it open to the understanding. But how is the New Testament to be understood?

Occasionally, but only seldom, the New Testament expounds its own parables, and throws light on its dark sayings.[2] In the case of the Epistles to the Thessalonians, one explains the other; and the Epistle of S. James stands perhaps in a similar relation to Romans. The only reference to S. Paul's Epistles by name is in II. Peter, III. 15. But these explanations, though throwing light in one direction cast a shadow in another; and hence, they too need explaining. Sound exegesis bids us explain the difficult by the easy, and the obscure by the clear; but if we follow this principle, we shall often look in vain for the clear, or mistake the obscure for the clear. So the unaided individual cannot hope to understand Scripture aright, though this may be possible to believers who have received both faith and the Spirit who speaks in Holy Scripture. But not even faith gives sufficient security for a correct exposition of Holy Scripture. In some passages the law of God is said to be clear and easily understood; in others understanding is promised to those filled with the Spirit of God;[3] but these and similar passages bear generally on the moral life of believers, not on the understanding of Scripture, though on the whole, they make Scripture more easily understood, but not absolutely intelligible. Only to him who thinks and lives in the spirit of revelation, and who has already drunk deep of that spirit, is its meaning clear. The letter killeth; but the Spirit giveth life.[4] The words of the Lord are spirit and life. The spirit of Christian doctrine soars above the letter, and

[2] Math. xiii. xvi. 6 seq. John II. 21, 22; vii. 39, x. vii. 7 seq.; xii. 16; xv. 1 seq.

[3] Deut. xxx. 11. Ps. xviii. 9 (xix.); cxviii. (cxix.), 105. 130. Matth. v. 14. II. Pet. I. 19. II Cor. III. 3 seq.; iv. 3, 4.

[4] II. Cor. III. 6.

must surely be known, before it can be applied to Scripture. "He who holds fast to the maxim 'Unless ye believe, neither "'shall ye know,'—because he who believes, will receive under- "standing according to the measure of his faith, and will "accordingly utter these things, and give an explanation of them "based on faith—such a one will not only believe in Jesus "and in what is written, but will likewise understand its "meaning. For he who abides in the truth of faith, and abides "in the Logos, and in the works of the Logos, shall, according "to our Lord's promise, understand the truth."[4] Even the believer, Holy Scripture frequently says, needs a special illumination,[5] because the same spirit is not communicated to all alike,* and because the mysteries of faith are inscrutable and enigmatical.† Jesus indeed bids his disciples ask the Father for the good spirit,‡ but by this is meant generally the good gifts of God for a Christian life. What the believer asks the Father in Jesus' name, will be given to him. The prayer for insight and illumination will not be uttered in vain; but grace in itself is not an infallible means of understanding Holy Scripture, however necessary it may be. Even the disciples whom our Lord personally instructed, understood but little before the coming down of the Holy Ghost, and had not penetrated into the depths of Scripture.§ S. Peter finds that in the Epistles of S. Paul, there is much that is difficult to understand.‖

The Fathers are loud in their praise of the wisdom of Holy Scripture, and are astonished at the richness and fulness of its meaning.[6] The Canon of Scripture says Vincent of Lerins, is

4 Orig., *in Math.* xvi. 9 (ad xx. 29 seq.

5 Deut. xvii. 8 seq. Prov. xii. 11, 12. Mal. II. 7. II Chron. xix. 22. Math. xxiii. 2, 3. Acts xv. 28. Gal. II. 1, 2.

6 Iren., *adv Haer.* II. 28, 2, Tertull., *adv. Hermog* 22. Orig., *in Jerem.* xxi. 2. Num. xvii. 1. Athanasius, *c. gent.* I. 1. August., *de doctr. christ.* II. 9; *de Pecc. merit et rem.* II. 36. Greg. M. *in Job* l. xx. c. i. Other passages ap. Nat. Alex. H. E. Tom. III. p. 480 (Ed. Venet. 1771). See Kuhn, *Einl.* p. 43. *Theol. Quart.* 1858, p. 404.

* I. Cor. xii. 18.

† Ibid ii. 9; xiii. 12.

‡ Luke xi. 13. Cfr. Ep. of S. James 1. 5.

§ Luke xxiv. 25. 44.

‖ II. Peter iii. 15.

in itself more than all-sufficient. What is obscure in philosophy, remarks Chrysostom, is clear and easily understood in Scripture. Like Origen, he can hardly find words adequate to express the wisdom contained in S. Paul's Epistles. They are to him a wall of brass, encircling the Churches scattered over the face of the earth. S. Augustine advises the enquirer to interpret the obscure passages of Scripture by the clear. For the Holy Spirit has so disposed Scripture that hunger is appeased by the clear passages, and indigestion prevented by the obscure.[7] But, like the other Fathers, Augustine applied these principles to matters, either contained in the Creed, or that are absolutely necessary to Christian faith and life. Without the authority of the Church, he says, the Gospel can be neither believed nor understood. On the other hand, however, the Fathers distinctly declare that the meaning of Scripture is not clear, and that he who essays to interpret it without a trusty guide, will inevitably be ensnared in pitfalls. "The Scriptures," says Irenæus, "are perfect, having been spoken by God's Word; but we being creatures of a day, and inferior to the Word and His Spirit, are therefore without knowledge of his mysteries."[8]

To Tertullian Scripture seems to be a mine for heresy;[9] although he says elsewhere that other instruments would be required to draw from them any but Christian doctrines. Hence he disallows the appeal that heretics make to Scripture, because the decision does not rest with it.[10] Indeed, from Tertullian's statements, it would not be difficult to weave the famous lines written by the Reformer, Samuel Werenfels, on the ambiguity of Scripture.[11] "Neither the prophets," says Clement, "nor our Redeemer enunciated the mysteries of God plainly enough for all to understand them

7 Vincent. Ler. *Commonit.* II. Chrysost., *De Lazar. Hom.* III.; *In Ep. II. ad. Thess.* Hom. III. *De Sacerd.* iv. 8, 430. Aug., *de doctr. christ.* II. 6; ix. 14.

8 Iren., II. 28, 2.

9 *De Praescript.* c. 39. See Kuhn, in *Theol. Quart.* 1858, p. 251.

10 L.c. c., 15.

11 "Hic liber est, in quo sua quaerit dogmata quisque; invenit pariter dogmata quisque sua."—Diss. var. argum. P. II. p. 591.

"easily; but he spoke in parables, not in the Gospel alone, "but also in the Law and the Prophets. Now, it is said in "*Proverbs*:* 'All my words are right to them that under-"stand' i.e. to men that receive the clear explanation of "Scripture, that he (Christ) gave in the rule of the Church." Jerome writes to Paulinus[12] that he has forwarded him an explanation, in order that he may see that he cannot traverse the rugged road of Holy Scripture without a pioneer and a guide. His well-known scathing words, put in a nutshell the absurdity of each one attempting to interpret Scripture. Medicine is left to physicians, and the smith is supreme at the anvil, but every dolt thinks he can interpret Scripture. Even the devil, as Jerome and Athanasius observe, can strut in Scripture gait, in order to deceive men and lead them into error. Augustine administers a sharp rebuke to Christians who contend that the right understanding of Scripture comes *divino munere*, and that consequently no rule of interpretation is needed. Let them not, he says, quote S. Paul who received a revelation. And even if he had not, why should men, who boast of the divine gift of understanding all that is obscure in Scripture, think it necessary to expound Scripture to others? Should not they also have received the same gift? They, too, must be able to interpret for themselves, "*Deo ipso intus docente*," The sense of Holy Scripture, says Jerome,[13] is by no means plain; for the Gospel is not in the words, but in the sense; not on the skin, but in the marrow; not in the leaves and flowers of speech, but in the root of reason. Hence to understand Holy Scripture, we require the Holy Spirit who has not been vouchsafed to Marcion, Basilides and other heretics.

Where, then, is this Holy Spirit to be found? Not in individuals, as we have seen, but in the community. The

12 Rom. iii. 2. Acts vii. 38. Hebr. v. 12. I Petr. iv. 11.

13 Bickell, *Zeitschrift fur Kath. Theol.* 1887, p. 589. See Weiss, *Markusevangelium* Berlin 1882, p. 11. *Matthaeusevangelium*, Halle 1876, p. 1. *Leben Jesu*, Berlin 1882, I. 24.

* viii. 9.

Spirit, now working in the institution founded by Christ, who was at work before the New Testament was written, who unlocked the Old Testament,—the same must supply the key to the New. If, as some Protestant writers allow,[14] the agreement between the two Testaments is one of the ecclesiastical canons of exegesis; what can this mean but that it is the Spirit, ever-abiding in the Christian Church, who has made it possible to understand and to verify the prophecies in the Old Testament? "When the Law," says Irenæus,[15] "is now read to the Jews, it sounds like a "fable; for they have lost the key that can open their "minds to understand the appearance of the Son of God "in the flesh. But to the Christian who reads it, it is like "a treasure, hidden in a field, which has been unearthed, "and on which rays of light from the Cross of Christ are "streaming." This Spirit was also communicated from the Church to the faithful. For, says Tertullian,[16] the truth of Holy Scripture, and the interpretation thereof, is deposited with the vouchers of apostolic succession. "I see," says Peter, "that able men, when reading the Scrip-"tures, are beset by all kinds of thoughts, and hence that "we must beware of reading the Law of God according "to the lights of individual minds. For many words in "Holy Scripture will not bear the meaning that the indi-"vidual has previously attached to them. To draw the "true meaning out of Scripture, not to thrust foreign "ideas into it, must be the interpreter's aim. But this "requires that he should learn the sense of Scripture from "those who have in truth received and kept it, as it was "handed down by their forefathers."[17] By means of the gifts (*charismata*) those who have received the apostolic succession can expound Holy Scripture without danger of error.[18]

14 Friedlieb, *Leben Jesu*, Münster 1887, p. 249.

15 See also Bickel, l.c. p. 561.

16 See Zoekler, *Wider die unfehlbare Wissenschaft*. Eine Schutzschrift fur conservativisches theologisches Forschen. Nördlingen 1887. Against, Schurer, *Theol. Liter. Zeitg.* 1887, No. 11.

17 Clem., *Rec.* x. 42. Kuhn, l.c. p. 197.

18 Iren., iv. 26, 5. Kuhn, l.c. p. 218.

The *mind of the Church* (*ecclesiæ sensus*) is therefore the golden rule for explaining the Scriptures. And this, while revealing itself firstly and chiefly in the creeds, is also living and actual, and pervades her whole being. It is an immediate effect of the presence of the Divine Spirit, and of his action in moving, guiding and directing His Church. It is the rule both of faith and of exegesis.[19] And yet how shall it be described? For it is not *one* thing, but many. It is the sense, and idea, and objective spirit of Christian truth, which is ever manifesting itself in a variety of ways and directions, as the need arises, but is ever the same.[20] It is the apostolic tradition, the apostolic symbol of faith, but it is also the *pietas doctrinæ Catholicæ*[21]—the apostolic spirit, or temper, or instinct, which ever endures in the Church. If, says S. Augustine, the enquirer finds himself left in the lurch by rules of hermeneutics, let him take shelter in that rule of faith, which Scripture and the authority of the Church have bequeathed to him.[22] To the authority of the Canon, says S. Vincent of Lerins, howsoever perfect it be, must be joined the mind of the Church, because there are in Scripture depths deeper than ever plummet did sound, and hence one seeks to fathom one way, and another another; and the attempts to find bottom in the incomprehensive deeps, are as many and various as the commentators. And since error has an hundred heads, the prophets and apostles must be explained according to the mind of the Church.[23] Even the Gnostics admitted, in principle, that none but those who hold fast to tradition, can apprehend the truth of Scripture; but they practically abandoned the tradition of the Church for a fictitious esoteric apostolic tradition.[24]

19 Hippolyt. ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 28.
20 Kuhn, *Einleit.* p. 45.
21 Orig., *in Ep. ad. Rom.* v. 1.
22 Aug., *de doctr. christ.* III. 2.
23 *Commonit.* c. 2. Cf. Tertull., *de Praescr.* cc. 15, 17, 19. Clem. Alex. apud. Möhler, *Patrol.* p. 454. Schwane, *Dogmengeschichte*, I. 697. Kuhn, *Theol. Quart.* 1858, p. 394. Cyrill. Alex., Ep. 30 (x. 109).
24 Iren., III. 1, 2. Kuhn, *Einleit.* p. 328.

The rule of faith and the mind of the Church may therefore be viewed in a twofold light: objectively, as the Church's Creed, and subjectively, as the inward Spirit living in the Church and guiding her. In both senses, the two together constitute the rule (*norma*) of Scripture interpretation. Considered objectively, according to its contents as given by Christ, the rule of faith precludes all doubt, and is absolute truth;[25] but the same truth, considered subjectively and in its application, becomes the mind and inward spirit of the universal Church. Irenæus urges both points. And if, as is said,[26] he was the first "to proclaim that the formula of baptism definitely explained, is the apostolic *regula veritatis*," he likewise proclaimed aloud, against heretics, that the Church is the guiding principle that preserves the apostolic faith pure. "For where the "Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the "Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace; for "the Spirit is truth." So, according to Irenæus, the Church and the Spirit are correlatives.[27] Without the Spirit, the Church could not exist; but as the Church exists, it is clear that the Spirit is in her. The two are inseparable; the one completes the other; and therefore the Church's interpretation, being framed according to the rule of faith, has the Spirit on its side. It alone is *authentic*. But the universal Church must be speaking through the corporate body of the successors of the Apostles, that is through general councils, or through the Head, as the infallible successor of Peter. Those utterances only are universally binding which form part of a dogmatic definition; but the number of passages that have received such direct authentic explanation is small.[28]

25 Tertull., *de Praescr.* c. 13. See *Theol. Quart.* l.c. p. 237, 394.
26 Harnack, p. 262. Kuhn, *Einleit.* p. 340 and *Theol. Quart.* l.c. p. 199, 233.
27 Kuhn, *Theol. Quart.* p. 224, 414. Schell, *das Wirken des dreieinigen Gottes*, p. 351.
28 See *Kirchenlexicon*, 2 Ed. iv. 1091 s. v. '*Exegese.*' (The article in the Kirchenlexicon is written by Dr. Schanz. He, there, enumerates the passages which are generally admitted to be dogmatic in the full sense of the term, i.e., whose meaning is definitely fixed. He, likewise, explains how and when the *mind of the Church* is a *regula obligans*, and when a *regula directiva* only, of interpretation. Tr.)

From all this it follows, that the interpretation of Scripture, in matters concerning faith and morals, is for the most part dependent on the general rule of faith, and on the sense of the Church. Faith, dogma, and the usage of the universal Church are the finger-posts on which the believer, when reading Scripture, must keep his eye, lest he leave the highway for crooked bye-ways. Now the Church's explanation is enshrined in a living tradition, in her liturgy, preaching, and catechisms; in the writings of those Fathers who flourished on the borderland of the Apostolic age; yea, in the whole life of that Church, whose heart's-blood, and very breath and soul were created out of Holy Scripture. Hence, for those moving in the midst of the Church's life of faith, the "analogy of faith,"* will, on the whole, be a sufficient clue to the right interpretation of Scripture, in all the main questions. And this is sufficient for the individual, according to the measure of his faith. Absolute objective security cannot be had without a *consensus* of the Church's witnesses. In the agreement of all, or the most noteworthy of the Fathers, lies, firstly, the best possible human guarantee that the interpretation is correct, and secondly, a sure sign that the Holy Spirit is speaking in the Church. When Fathers, of East and West, and of every age, who were loyal to the Church, staunch in faith, holy in their lives, faithful in their duty to God, and distinguished by their learning, agree on important points, their *consensus unanimis* must be due to the general doctrine of tradition, and to the action of the Holy Spirit guiding the Church. To say that all commentators, from Origen downwards, have interpreted dogmatic and moral precepts in their own way,[29] ignoring the Church and the unanimous teaching of the Fathers, is utterly untrue. On the contrary, the Church's faith, sense and spirit, were ever their guiding star in all they wrote. In commentaries and dogmatic treatises the later Fathers frequently appeal to the earlier. In his Prologues, Jerome enumerates his

29 *Vindiciae Jahnii*, 1822, p. 145.
* Rom. xii. 8.

predecessors in order. Cyril of Alexandria compares the commentator with the busy bee, which flies from one flower to another and gathers honey from all. With the later compilers of *Catenæ*, the marshalling of patristic commentaries became a regular practice.

The Church has directly ordered that in matters of faith and morals the interpretation of the Fathers be followed. Thus the Council in *Trullo* (692 A.D.) decrees in chapter 19: "If any dispute about Scripture arise, the Church's "rulers must not settle it otherwise than the luminaries "and doctors of the Church have set forth in their writ-"ings." The fifth Council of Lateran (1512 A.D.) in its eleventh session issued the following order: "We order "all teachers of the Gospel to expound Scripture accord-"ing to the teaching of those whom the Church or long-"standing usage has recognized as authorities." The Council of Trent, in its fourth session, in order to curb petulant and headstrong spirits, ordered: "that no one, "relying on his own skill, shall—in matters of faith, and "of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doc-"trine,—wresting the sacred Scriptures to his own senses, "presume to interpret the said sacred Scripture contrary "to that sense which holy Mother Church,—whose it is to "judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy "Scriptures,—hath held and doth hold; or even contrary "to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; even though "such interpretations were never (intended) to be at any "time published."

To this decree the Vatican Council has added an explanation because it "is by some badly interpreted." "We, renewing the said decree, declare this to be their "sense, that, in matters of faith and morals, appertaining "to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be held "as the true sense of Holy Scripture which our Holy "Mother the Church hath held and holds, to whom it be-"longs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the "Holy Scripture; and, therefore, that it is permitted to no "one to interpret the Sacred Scripture contrary to this

"sense, nor, likewise, contrary to the unanimous consent "of the Fathers."

Thus a positive criterium is put side by side with the negative.[30] The sense of the Church as set forth in the faith and practice of Christian life, and in ecclesiastical tradition and literature, should be the leading principle of interpretation. On its positive side this rule of interpretation was intended to apply only to such passages of Scripture as are formally and materially dogmatic. And even here a certain latitude is allowed. For once the dogmatic truth is allowed to be contained therein, it matters not as to the manner in which it is derived from text and context. And since, moreover, the Vatican Council singles out no particular passages,[31] the obligation, imposed on the Catholic commentator of extracting dogmatic truth from Scripture, is rather general than particular. He is not, therefore, in any way, yoked to the atomistic processes resorted to by those, who imagine that all is over, when they have collected together a score of Scripture passages in proof of a doctrine.

Next, it may be asked, how does the case stand with Exegesis as a science? Catholic commentators are not infrequently reproached with lacking independence in dogmatic matters, and consequently with moving in a traditional rut. If the objection merely means, they may not tamper with certain definite principles (Canon, Inspiration, Authorship), and that they may not cast aside as old lumber the views of the great patristic commentators and later theologians, the reproach is well-merited. But this, we submit, is not a flaw but a jewel in Catholic exegesis. For all truly Christian Exegesis must interpret Scripture in the way it has been handed down. Hence it must find its charter in the ordinances of the old Christian faith, or it is debarred from pleading in a Christian Court. To doubt, caustically remarks

30 Cf. Bulla super forma juramenti professionis fidei. In Append. Canonum et Decretorum.

31 Scheeben I. 131. Simar, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*, 2 Ed. Freiburg, 1887, p. 40. Otherwise Martin, *Die Arbeiten des Vatic. Concils.* Paderborn, 1873, p. 18.

S. Augustine,[32] what the whole Church believes, is a mark of consummate folly and audacious impudence. The commentator, like all believers, is bound by the rule of Vincent of Lerins; that is, by "What has been believed always, everywhere, and by all." "Or is it likely that so "many and such illustrious Churches have gone astray "after one faith? Amid many possibilities *one* end is like "none. Error would have changed again and again. "What is found as one by many, did not arise through "error, but came from tradition."[33]

Neither will the student of theological science refuse the Fathers a hearing, even on questions not immediately connected with faith and morals. For the language of Holy Scripture, or at least of the text, was their mother tongue, and they were acquainted with the tradition and history of the first centuries. For the rest, the Catholic commentator is at liberty to differ, when necessary, from the Fathers on scientific questions; for on such, their views are often as wide apart as the poles. To further the scientific understanding of Scripture, the Catholic commentator will diligently gather whatever he can from the study of grammar, history, antiquities, and the rest. The greater the precautions taken, the more marked will be the success. How many wrong roads have been traversed by commentators outside the Church, from the Gnostics (those first Bible theologians) down to our own day! Is it not generally admitted by Protestant commentators that Luther's exposition of the Epistle to the Romans was, to say the least, one-sided? Is it not allowed that the drift of this Epistle has hitherto been misunderstood? Why, then, should it now be reputed absurd to follow the Spirit, that has been at work for centuries in the Church, in explaining the sacred documents of traditional Christianity? Some, no doubt, will be tempted to flout in our faces, the interpretation put on the passages bearing on the world-system. But, as is well known, many other reasons, chiefly philo-

32 *Ep.* 54 (al. 118) 5.
33 Tertull., *de Praescr.*, c. 28, cf. Franzelin, l.c. p. 248 seq. M. Canus, *de Locis Theol.* III. 4.

sophical, were thrown into the scale of this interpretation. That these passages were made to square with the views then in vogue, instead of with a truth which was not fully established till later, may be regrettable owing to the consequences, but it is withal quite natural and intelligible. *Usum non tollit abusus.* Neither then nor since has the Church given an authentic explanation. Only, be it remembered, that Protestant exegesis voted even more solid against the Copernican system. From a merely human standpoint, we are fairly entitled to ask: Has any institution had to retrace its steps oftener, or to correct as many errors, as those very profane sciences which lay claim to the most perfect knowledge? What has undergone more transformations than Philosophy? Even than natural science, which has only just now attained any certain results?

The Council of Trent likewise thought that it would be for the good of the Church, if, of all the Latin editions of the Scriptures in use, one were declared to be authentic. And therefore it declared, that in all public dissertations, disputations, sermons and expositions, the ancient Latin Vulgate, which had been consecrated by centuries of use in the Church, should be regarded as authentic; and that no one, on any pretext whatsoever, should presume to reject it. This last part of the decree the Vatican Council did not adopt, although it fixed the Canon on the lines of the Vulgate. But the decree, as the context shows, was aimed not at the original text, but at the many Latin editions, which widely diverged from one another. As against these the Vulgate is declared to be an authentic translation.[34] In the state of linguistic studies at that time, the original text could not possibly have been declared the basis of exegesis and ecclesiastical instruction. Moreover, a great deal of uncertainty prevailed about the original itself. Was it not then the best course to declare the Vulgate authentic in matters of faith and morals? But, independently of this, the text of the Vulgate is in itself of no small value. Cassiodorus could say, not without

34 Franzelin, l.c. p. 500. Wilke, p. 84.

reason, that Jerome's translation was almost an adequate substitute for the Hebrew text. Only prejudice and ignorance can stigmatize S. Jerome's masterpiece of philology and theology as worthless. Jerome's translation of the Bible is in its way a "masterpiece," writes a literary historian who can hardly be suspected of theological bias.[35] But the science of interpretation is weighted with no such precept. It is quite free to start with the original, although due and reasonable regard must be paid to the ecclesiastical edition. The Fathers themselves, Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus and others have never ceased to counsel a reference to the original, to explain difficult passages in the text.[36]

Owing to the state of linguistic science, the Vulgate was the model on which all the early translations into the vernacular were built. These go further back than was heretofore surmised; nor were they due to heretical influence e.g. Waldenses.[37] Here ecclesiastical usage and linguistic knowledge joined hands. Yet, how much the authorities of the Church had at heart the restoration of the original text is shown by the Complutensian Polyglot (1525), the oldest attempt of its kind, which was due to the initiative and the munificence of Cardinal Ximenes. In the 16th century a long series of illustrious men rendered most signal services to Biblical Science. We need mention only Sixtus of Siena, Bellarmine, Xantes Pagninus, Steuchus Eugubinus, and Montanus.[38]

A further consequence of the above-mentioned principles of interpretation, is the decree, that translations should be provided with suitable explanations, and be approved by ecclesiastical authority. For the uninstructed and the faithful this is so much the more necessary, as the danger

35 Teuffel, *Römische Literatur*. 3 Ed. p. 1083. Diestel, *Altes Testament*, p. 93. See Welte, *Kirchliches Ansehen der sog. latein. Vulgata*, in *Theol. Quart.* 1845, p. 55, 348.

36 Hieron., Ep. 74 ad Aug.; 106 ad Suniam et Tretellum. Aug., *de doctr. christ.* II. 12, 19. Cassiod. c. 15.

37 See Jostes, *Die Waldenser und die vorlutherische deutsche Bibelübersetzung*. Münster, 1885. *Die Tepler Bibelübersetzung*. Münster, 1886.

38 See *Kirchenlexicon*, iv. 1115.

is now greater of heterodox commentaries coming into their hands. Nowadays there are not a few men, who bring forward difficulties in order to bring Scripture itself into discredit, so there is all the more need to imitate the example of Cyril of Alexandria who, in contrast with the Arians, requires us to try, by a "pious" explanation, to establish agreement between passages seemingly discordant.[39]

Non-catholic exegesis, having flung to the winds tradition and the sense of the Church, must needs, by force of its own principle, establish between man and the Word of God the same immediate contact, as it has established between man and Christ, in the matter of justification. For the principles it has rejected it must find a substitute either in the spirit of man, as filled with the Spirit of God, or in the Spirit which speaks in the letter of Holy Scripture. So when Holy Scripture is read, the Spirit must either reveal itself from within the spirit of man, or speak from Holy Scripture. The former leads with equal facility either to rationalism or fanaticism. The latter, the mysterious indwelling of the Spirit in the Bible, can hardly be meant *au sérieux*, otherwise divergent, changing explanations would not be possible.[40] Until, therefore, some new authority replaces the old, exegesis becomes, on principle, purely subjective. Again, the principle of justification by faith alone, which from Luther's time dominated Protestant theology and Protestant exegesis, is not self-supporting, but is reared on other postulates. Bullinger's summary shows how the several parts of the edifice were shaking and tottering to a fall: "We admit as orthodox and "genuine no explanation of Scripture that is not extracted "from Scripture itself (i.e., from the spirit of the language "in which they were written, judged according to circum-"stances, and by comparing the many clear passages, like "and unlike), and which does not agree with the rules of "faith and love, and redound to the honour of God and the

39 *Thesaur.* c. 11 (viii. 55 B.)
40 *Kirchenlexicon*, l.c. 1095. Kuhn, *Einleit.* p. 54.

"salvation of man. . . . We do not, indeed, despise "the exposition of Greek and Latin Fathers, nor do we "reject their disputations and dissertations on sacred sub- "jects, but we modestly depart from them if they are for- "eign or opposed to Holy Scripture."[41]

41 *Confess. Helvet.* II. 2.

CHAPTER XV.

THE GOSPEL AND THE GOSPELS.

In order to form a correct estimate of the life and teaching of Jesus, some acquaintance with those books of the New Testament, in which his words, works and sufferings are recorded, is essential. For the Apostles, who were privileged to hear the words of truth that flowed from his lips, and to witness the miracles worked by the Lord of life and death, and the Ruler of the winds and waves, in Galilee and Judæa, have written, for our instruction, an account of the persecution and sufferings he underwent at the hands of the Jews, and also of his triumph over death, the grave, and hell. These reminiscences left by the Apostles, says Justin, are called Gospels.

What a treasure-store of joy and bliss is that word Gospel! It means the glad tidings of salvation that Jesus brought from heaven to men, who were sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death; it means redemption from sin and death, and reconciliation with our Father in heaven. Where, but in this thrice blessed word, in this power of God, which is salvation to every one that believes, whether Jew or Greek, was helpless man to find the saving word? From the message itself, with its meaning and contents, the name passed to the writings. The Gospel. together with the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles go to make up the New Testament Canon. And it is called the Gospel, or the fourfold Gospel, as Irenæus explains, because men were firmly persuaded that the four Gospels

together contain one and the same glad tidings of redemption. To them we owe all that has come down to us of the life of Jesus. The apostolic letters are merely confirmatory, and the additional sayings that tradition has preserved, are neither numerous nor well authenticated.* Nay, tradition has even failed to supply the exact dates of his birth and death.

But here we are at once confronted by the Apocryphal Gospels, which were composed for the purpose of filling the gaps left by the canonical Gospels. They cannot be all fiction. Some of the threads, with which legend has spun its webs, must be historical. But it is extremely difficult to separate the corn from the chaff, to find the grain of truth hid in the bushel of pious and poetic fancy. Had they been less transformed and twisted in opposite interests, heretical and ecclesiastical; had they come down to us from the second century, in their oldest form; even so, for a life of Jesus, they would be but slightly available. Many sayings, indeed, have passed from them into the storehouse of the Church's legends; others have gained a footing in her Liturgy, and these serve for edification, or give concrete expression to a religious idea that is independent of them. But as sources for a life of Jesus they have no weight. The Fathers passed severe strictures on them, and Pope Gelasius attached to them the note of censure.

So, the four Gospels, which the Catholic world has recognized from the outset, are our only resource. But, in what relation do they stand, firstly to the one Gospel, and secondly to one another? Hence arises a two-horned problem: the relation of the Synoptic Gospels to one another, and to S. John's Gospel. The former is of long standing. For as the first three Gospels go over a common ground, the Synoptic problem was too glaring to escape the criticism of the Fathers. Origen has noted that Luke omits what the others narrate, and vice-versa. Any additions to Matthew would run the risk of repetition.[1] Cyril

1 *In Joan.* vi. 31.
* Justin, Clement of Alexandria.

of Alexandria, following in his wake, says that Mark, though running on parallel lines (ἀκολούθως) with Matthew, abridged him. But, on the other hand, by way of completing the story, he drags in the Herodians, whom Matthew had passed over.[2] [*] Divers accounts, thinks Chrysostom, are not misleading. For if all the Gospels had been the same, some would have been useless; if all had been different, and touched on fresh topics, the proof of harmony and unity would not have been to hand. Hence, though saying much in common, each one tells the story in his own way. Neither omissions nor additions constitute a contradiction, but one writer supplements another.[3] "As you see," says Ambrose, "Luke has intentionally passed over what the others wrote." Bede unreservedly makes this view his own.

The parallelism, as Origen has observed, is most striking in the case of Matthew and Mark. No unprejudiced reader, on comparing the two, can evade the dilemma, that either Mark is dependent on Matthew, or Matthew on Mark. The latter alternative never crossed the minds of the ancients; from the first, the Gospel of S. Matthew was held to be the oldest. S. Augustine clearly speaks of Mark, as abbreviating and following in the footsteps of Matthew (*pedissequus et abbreviator*).[4] He also observes generally: "Each one, indeed, cleaves to his own order, but "none intended to ignore those who had previously written. Rather, each, as he was inspired, made additions, "which were by no means superfluous." Bede followed Augustine's leadership. To all thoughtful minds these statements were self-evident. And when, in Erasmus' time, a fresh impetus was given to Biblical studies, the hypothesis of Mark's dependence on Matthew (i.e. the *dependence hypothesis*) passed current. Not a shimmer of doubt on this head flashed across the minds of Maldonatus,

2 *Ad. Marc.* I. 3, 15, 34; viii. 15.
3 *In Math. Hom.* I. 4; iv. 1; xxvi. 5.
4 *De Cons. Evv.* I. 2, 1; 2, 4. Beda, *Epist. Respons. ad Accam. Comment ad Luc.* cf. ad vii. 10.
* Mark viii. 15.

Jansenius, or others. A Lapide, after referring to the above passage from Augustine, thus writes: "Each one writes "in his own style, but agrees in meaning and in matter "with the others. One speaks where another is silent; "one expands where another condenses; one puts in clear "light what another had but obscurely hinted."[5] Calmet is equally outspoken in the same sense. This view held its ground without a break till this century. Hug, though he credits each Evangelist with intending to amend his predecessors, is most eloquent in its defence. Patrizi is all in its favour. "On comparing the two, he who runs "may read that the one must have written with the other "under his eyes; still it is easy to see that Mark is more "polished and methodical. All this points to the hand, "which, while borrowing the narratives and discourses "from Matthew, filled in the gaps and tried to arrange the "matter in better order. For it was part of Mark's plan "to improve and polish the narrative."[6] Franzelin sums up the present (1870) position of the question as follows: "Learned men believe and teach that Mark wrote with "Matthew's Gospel before him." For a long time Protestants also supported this hypothesis.[7]

This century, among other unlooked-for complications, has seen a new theory of the relation of the Synoptists, raised as a superstructure on the dependence-hypothesis. It goes by the name of the Griesbach hypothesis, and its advocates, even in our own day, are many.[8] It assigns the third place to Mark's Gospel, which it regards as, in a manner, compiled from both Matthew and Luke. Nor does it seemingly lack historical foundation. For Clement of Alexandria says that the Gospels containing genealogies were written first.[9] But this passage, besides having well-accredited tradition arrayed against it, may also be explained on the dependence-hypothesis. And if Clement

5 *Prooem in Evang.* c. 2. See Schanz, *Comment. in Math.* p. 25.
6 *De Evangeliis*, I. 6. Franzelin, *de Trad. et Script.* p. 304.
7 See Schanz, *Comment. in Marc.* p. 26.
8 *ib.* p. 28.
9 Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14, 5.

can claim the early presbyters on his side, so can Origen appeal to them as favouring the view that the Gospel of the publican was written first, then Mark's, then Luke's. And with this the order in the codices completely agrees. The few exceptions, in which the authors are enumerated according to rank and position, do but prove the rule. But the main arguments for the Griesbach hypothesis are drawn from the composition of Mark's Gospel, many passages of which undoubtedly leave the impression of having been culled from both Matthew and Luke.[10] But what are these paltry details, when set against the whole tenor and plan of the Gospel? Why, in the first place, should Mark have omitted so much from Luke? To this question no sufficient answer is given. Secondly, Mark's Gospel is too original in language and conception to bear so mechanical an hypothesis. Nor, again, will the explanation, hazarded by some critics, from the tendency of the writers, hold good, because it is backed by no historical evidence. The evidence on which the Synoptic Gospels, even in their present form, rest, is so excellent that every attempt to transport their origin to the second century is foredoomed to failure. Clearly, too, Luke's Gospel represents an advanced stage in apostolic preaching.

But may not Mark's Gospel be the oldest? This question brings us face to face with the *Marcus-hypothesis*, which assumes either that the Canonical Gospel was written first, or that there was an original writer, Mark, whose work may have been longer or shorter than our second Canonical Gospel. This latter assumption is the more general; the former is less frequently met with. This hypothesis has now found almost universal favour with Protestants, and the influence it has had in shaping the story of Jesus' life has been decisive. For historical support it leans on the *Fragmenta* of Papias,[11] which Schleier-

10 Compare Mark I. 32. 42; II. 13; v. 2; vi. 14; viii. 27; x. 46.

11 Ap. Euseb. III. 39 (40, 17 L.). See Schanz, *Die Markushypothese*, in *Theol. Quart.* 1871, p. 489. Also *Comment. in Math.* p. 26, *in Marc.* p. 29. *Theol. Quart.* 1882, p. 517; 1885, p. 216, 638.

macher in 1832 referred to some writings of Matthew and Mark, other than their present Canonical Gospels. Matthew, it is contended, originally collected nothing but the sayings of our Lord (λόγια κυριακά), while Mark, after hearing Peter preach, jotted down from memory, without regard to order, our Lord's acts and discourses. Mark's Gospel in its present form, is a re-setting of the original Mark; whereas Matthew's Gospel was made up at a later period from the "sayings," and from the original or the Canonical Mark.

To bolster up this view of Papias' *Fragmenta*, special emphasis is laid on the expression λόγια which, it is alleged, applies to no one Gospel. But Philo and Josephus use it to describe the chief contents of the Old Testament; the word is also found in the New.[12] Clement of Rome makes the λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ parallel with the Scriptures, and uses the phrase to denote generally the doctrine of salvation. Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, it is allowed, describe the Gospels as τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου. According to Ephraem, the Syrian, the Canon was made up of the Old Testament, the sayings of the Lord, and the preaching of the Apostles. Although, then, no authority, quite contemporary with Papias, identifies the *Logia* with the Gospels, still Irenæus' mode of expression, seeing that he came from Asia Minor, sufficiently justifies us in putting a similar construction on the phrase in Papias; especially since Papias explained our Lord's sayings in five books, and may have been induced, by oral tradition, and his predilection for Christ's sayings, to choose this expression. It was, in fact, most natural to apply a term in general use to S. Matthew's Gospel which has recorded our Lord's sayings more copiously than the other Synoptists. The reference to Hebrew dialects shews that the Greek text lay before him, and that he was contrasting not the compass and contents, but the language. For this reason also Eusebius inserted both this and the fragment relating to

12 Clem. Alex., *Strom*. vi. p. 676. Hieron., Ep. 53 (al. 103) Adv. Lucif. 28. Athanas., *C. Arian. Or*. I. 8. See Kuhn, in *Theol. Quart*. 1858, p. 432.

Mark; but he seems to have found nothing in Papias relative to Luke and John. That the foundation set on Papias' *Fragmenta* is not sure, is clear from the fact, that it has been thought necessary to clothe the "collection of Logia" with flesh and blood, by extracting from it historical introductions and expositions, minute details, and a whole series of narratives common to Matthew and Mark. Without some such evolution this so-called oldest Gospel is utterly inconceivable. Only thus could it be explained how Mark's Gospel "enlarged upon the brief sketches of events, "while omitting, for the most part, all the longer dis-"courses."[13]

Next, we may enquire, whether Papias' words warrant a distinction between an original and a Canonical Mark. For in saying that Mark's Gospel grew out of Peter's discourses, which Mark wrote down, but "not in order," Papias does not say that it was void of all order, as if it were a confused heap of broken discourses and facts (λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα). Nor, again, is the arrangement in the Canonical Gospel of Mark so fixed and so artistic, that Papias' description would be inapplicable. It is far more likely, that Papias set it down as wanting in order, by comparison with another well-known Gospel, which is, in all probability, not that of John but of Matthew, the arrangement of which rests chiefly in the groups of discourses. These are almost wholly wanting in Mark. For Matthew such an arrangement was of the highest importance. But Mark aimed at giving an historically progressive narrative, and grouped the details differently.

Luke is the only Evangelist, who has left a record of his literary labours. In the prologue to his Gospel he says: "For as much as many have taken in hand "to set forth in order a narration of the things that "have been accomplished among us; according as "they have delivered them unto us, who from the be-"ginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word: "it seemed good to me also, having diligently attained

13 *Ad. Gal.* I. 11, 12. Cf. Justin., *Dial.* 119.

"to all things from the beginning, to write to thee in order, most excellent Theophilus. That thou mayest know "the verity of those words in which thou hast been instructed."* What Gospels were already known to Luke? Heretical, apocryphal Gospels, think the Fathers. But since nothing has come down to us from the first century about apocryphal Gospels, they must have been well-meaning attempts of the faithful. Luke does not, in any way, intend to censure; he only finds them insufficient for his purpose. But are Matthew and Mark also to be reckoned among the "many"? Is it conceivable that the most important of the existing Gospels should have escaped Luke, who was zealously investigating everything? Such a supposition cannot be entertained. In fact, it is now almost universally admitted that Mark's Gospel was the well-head of Luke's. And although, in face of the great discrepancies in the two texts, the critical school have, till quite recently, been unwilling to concede that Luke was conversant with Matthew's Gospel, a reaction has set in, and this point is now for the most part granted. Such knowledge, it used to be said, "directly contradicts Luke's "own words" and "gives the lie to the very purpose for "which he wrote his Gospel."[14] But those who took up this position, have abandoned it as untenable. Least of all, in the supposition that the Gospels were intended as annotations for the preaching of the Apostles, could they have remained unknown to Luke, who was exploring all sources of information. Whether the "collection of Logia" is useful and necessary, as most Protestants contend, for explaining the simpler and, so to speak, more decomposed discourses of the third Gospel, may be open to question. For since it is very problematical whether this collection existed, no great probability can attach to this conjecture. Anyhow, for the history of the Sacred Infancy and the Flight into Egypt, Luke had other sources at his command.

14 Ritschl, *Rechtfertigung* II. 17. Harnack, *Dogmengesch.* p. 269, Notes.
* Luke 1, 1-4.

But it will naturally be asked, if Luke used the other Synoptists, why is there such variety of detail? and why is his general plan and arrangement so different from theirs? We are not concerned with the greater bulk of matter supplied by Luke; for this he might have gathered either from the written sources at his command, or from eye-witnesses of the events, in other words, from tradition. But we have in mind the discrepancies in the materials common to all. Why should the Evangelists have made such small, and at times, such trifling changes? Is it not rather bold to attribute all these changes directly to the Evangelists? What then becomes of their historical trustworthiness? It is hardly becoming, some think, to throw all the blame on the Evangelists; and they feel a difficulty in supposing that one Evangelist corrected and amended another. Well and good; but how are we to get rid of the discrepancies and changes? Is historical fidelity perchance better assured by removing the burthen from the back of the Evangelists, and laying it on the shoulders of tradition? No material gain whatever would accrue from this process; nay it would entail distinct loss, because the only ground for a natural explanation would be thereby abandoned. For we cannot suppose that the changes were purely arbitrary.

The greater number fall in with the scope of the writer, and are intimately bound up with the conception and plan of his work. To find disagreement in local and numerical details is indeed surprising; but the difficulty is equally great for the traditional hypothesis. Luke, in my opinion, did not change, e.g. the six days spoken of by Matthew and Mark, into eight,* arbitrarily, but in accordance with his sources of information. Could he have made the changes, unless he had thought them correct? The traditional hypothesis would not help to remove the contradiction, if such really existed; but would rather tend to encircle both accounts with a mist of uncertainty. The Evangelist was not like a private student or chronicler. He, living in the midst of the Apostolic community, knew its

* ix. 8.

needs and dangers; he had drunk in the spirit of the Gospel and had put it in practice in the work of his vocation. This spirit, and his own experience combined, not literary caprice or pedantry, guided him in selecting and arranging his materials. Far from being cut off from tradition, he was in closest touch with it; nor could he be ignorant of what others, eye witnesses or disciples of eye-witnesses, had written before him. The dependence-hypothesis has failed to solve the Synoptic problem, for no other reason, but because it sought to explain the Gospels solely by their literary dependency, one on another. This same reason, which prompted Gieseler to launch the traditional hypothesis in 1818, has induced many Catholic commentators (e.g. Schegg, Knabenbauer, Cornely, Camus, Friedlieb), and some Protestants (e.g. Godet) to sail under its colours. In so far as it maintains that the hitherto neglected traditional element permeates the Gospels, its opposition to the dependence hypothesis is justified; but it overshoots the mark when it, in turn, discards all written sources.

There can be no doubt that preaching and catechetical instructions have caused our Lord's sayings and the Gospel narratives to be formed into groups. Tradition, too, has certainly fixed the chief incidents in our Lord's life, e.g. his appearance at Capharnaum, his entry into Jerusalem, his death and resurrection, and the confession of Peter. S. Paul tells the Galatians that he had, as it were, set forth Jesus Christ crucified before their eyes*; he reminds the Corinthians of the Gospel he had preached,† and of the last supper.‡ In certain important decisions, he quotes a definite saying of Jesus.§ From this it must be admitted that some of the sayings, and some parts of the life of Jesus, were told more coherently in instructions. It is quite possible, too, that the Apostles had compiled in Jerusalem, reminiscences of their intercourse with our Lord. But why did they confine themselves to his *ministry in Galilee*? Is it

* III. 1.
† I. Cor. xv. 1.
‡ Ibid xi. 23.
§ I. Thessal. iv. 15; I. Cor. vii. 10; ix. 14.

because the events that happened in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem were known? But this is not in itself a sound reason. For were not the Apostles also bound to look to their preaching beyond? Or, again, why did they in that case embody in their narrative the events of the last days of his Passion in Jerusalem? Why should the Apostles, when preaching to the broad world, have been committed to such a narrow scheme? S. Peter no more considered it binding on him in Rome, than in his sermons recorded in the *Acts*. Why, for instance, should he have passed over in silence the raising of Lazarus, when he mentioned the raising of Jairus' daughter? But with an evangelist, who had a predecessor, the case was different. Matthew gives a definite reason for confining his narrative to Galilee.* But an evangelist, who wrote outside Palestine, could have no reason for so doing, except the example of a predecessor.

The same conclusion is forced upon us, not merely by the omissions, but also by the actual narratives. Despite their agreements, each evangelist has his own characteristics. Hence they must have followed different traditions, nay, there must have been several great streams of tradition from which they drew their narratives. This, of course, seems to slacken that unity of the Gospels, on which so much stress has been laid. For the differences affect not only the bulk, but the whole character of the Gospels. But if, in addition to the ramifications of tradition, the scope and individuality of the writer be taken into account, there is less difficulty. The Fathers, for the most part, merely tell the story of the origin of the Gospels as they had learnt it from tradition. But, as is clear from the passages already quoted, when reflecting on the bearings of one on the other, they all agree that the later evangelist did not write in ignorance of those who had written before him. But to build up the traditional hypothesis on these patristic statements, would be most difficult and the extreme edge of hazard, even as regards S. Matthew's Gospel. For the conditions required for

* Math. iv. 13.

apostolic preaching are thus fixed by S. Peter: "Where-"fore of these men who have companied with us, all the "time that the Lord Jesus came in and went out amongst "us, beginning from the baptism of John until the day "wherein he was taken up from us, one of these must be "made a witness with us of his resurrection."* Now it is the Gospel, not of Matthew, but of Mark, that somewhat answers these conditions. So the two can scarcely be set down as merely the meeting of two streams of tradition. S. Luke's Gospel, moreover, contains an history of the Sacred Infancy, which, again, would imply a corresponding tradition among the heathen converts.

On the supposition, then, that the agreement among the Synoptists, and the common ground on which they tread, is owing to their dependence on one another, the discrepancies must be explained, in the main, by the circumstances under which they committed the tradition to writing. The form, indeed, down to the use of favourite particles may often be quite accidental and peculiar to the individual (*Τοτε, ευθύς, ἐγένετο δὲ,* and *καὶ ἐγένετο, μετὰ τοῦτο,* and *μετὰ ταῦτα, ὅυν*). But when there is a certain regularity and purposeness, coupled with special omissions and enlargements, the fact of a definite aim in the writer is unmistakable. Or may it possibly be the shot of accident or the dart of chance? Or is tradition the sole cause? One often writes as if he knew of no other narrative; or to suit his own ends, he makes the framework of his story wholly different. Each evangelist, as S. Augustine reminds us, tried to make his narrative read consecutively, and disposed the materials accordingly. For while omitting all that he does not want, he weaves all the threads together into one continuous yarn. But as one inserts the omissions of the other, a closer inspection will reveal the precise points where the omissions have been smoothed over, and where the parts have been so dovetailed one into the other as to appear a connected whole."[17] Later writers, including S. Thomas, simply bowed

17 *De Cons. Evv.* II. 5, 16.

* Acts i. 21.

assent to these principles. And, indeed, in no other way can the discrepancies,—for instance, between the first and third Gospel in the history of the Infancy and Ressurrection,—be explained. The mere hypothesis of literary dependence is unequal to the task; and so, too, considering S. Luke's accuracy (ἀκρίβεια), is the Traditional hypothesis alone. But once the existence of higher aims is realized, the reason of the discrepancies is clearly mirrowed forth in the plan and scope of the work. Our conception of each Gospel, as a whole, will grow juster and truer, the more we refer the several peculiarities to their scope. But, of course, no commentator can hope to make everything transparently clear.

Here we can give but a few general notes on the scope and aim of the evangelists; for a detailed application, we must refer the reader to special commentaries. Starting from the principle that all the Gospels, like all the Epistles, were addressed to believers, and were not a proselytising agency (this being carried out by preaching), we may state their relative scope as follows: Matthew wrote his Gospel to comfort and strengthen the Jewish Christians, who had been driven by oppression to the brink of apostasy, by showing that our Lord had not forfeited, but perfected his Messianic character by his lowly life and shameful sufferings and death; that the rejection of the Jewish people, and the persecutions under which Christians were groaning, did not contradict the Messianic promises. The Jews had invoked the blood of their Messias on themselves and their children, and the avenging hand of God would smite them by destroying Jerusalem. Mark's Gospel was designed to show Gentile Christians that Jesus, the preacher of the new doctrine and the founder of the new community, is the Son of God; and that he had manifested himself as such by word and deed to his disciples, who, in his name, and with the fulness of his power, preach his doctrine and continue his work. The purpose of Luke's Gospel is to strengthen the Pauline Gentile Christians in the faith that had been preached to them, by explaining the

negative and hostile attitude of the Jews, and by proving that the calling of the Gentiles had been, from the first, a fixed principle. God's mercy embraces with equal love the two nations hitherto rent asunder, and all poor miserable sinners, in order to save them from this wicked world and prepare them for the future kingdom of bliss. But their salvation is conditional on their conduct.

The scope, when thus defined, reveals a progressiveness in the Gospels. Not as if the first Gospel were *particularistic* i.e. the partisan Gospel of Jewish Christians, and the third *universalistic* i.e. the organ of Gentile Christians; or as if the original Gospel, as the critical school contends, were antagonistic to the Pauline Gospel. For the first Gospel proclaims aloud to Jewish Christians the universalism of the Gospel, by pointedly showing that the Jews had voluntarily and culpably disinherited themselves of the Messianic Kingdom. It is, so to speak, a threat dangling over the heads of the Jews. In the third Gospel, on the other hand, the universalism of the Gospel, to the benefits of which the Gentile Christians had been admitted, is represented as an accomplished fact. Mark's Gospel steers a middle course. While painting the life of Jesus in all the glowing colours that would have most attraction for well-meaning Gentile Christians, it avoids shading the picture with any hues and tints that were peculiarly Jewish. Consequently Matthew arranged the life of Jesus more in reference to the Old Testament, and was more solicitous about the main order of events than about minor points of detail. But Mark and Luke, writing for a different class of readers, gave less prominence to the Messianic idea, and rather chose to graphically describe the doings of Jesus. Thus they followed more the actual and historical course of events. Hence to the biographer, they are of more importance than Matthew; although we do not underrate him in this matter as much as most do.

Saint Luke's Gospel transcends all others in importance. Like Greek and Roman historians, he sketches in broad outline

universal history of the time.* By setting these sketches side by side with the statements in the prologue, some were led to suppose that Luke's scope was directly historical, as if, forsooth, he were writing merely in the interests of history. But the facts do not bear out this theory. For, in the first part of the Gospel, the striking, and seemingly intentional, departures from the order adopted by Mark are but few,* and there is, moreover, one complete omission.† Nor can this theory be proved "from the account of the journey," since the exact historical thread of it has not yet been traced. The promise held out in the prologue to write, "exactly," "in order," "from the beginning," is not to be interpreted more strictly than the phrase "all things;" and these epithets, while fully corresponding to the style of the narrative, do not apply to the order, nor imply a full treatment of events.[18] They hold out the prospect of a systematic order for the whole, and that order is substantially, though not exclusively, chronological. Without S. John's Gospel, to which S. Luke's forms in many respects a stepping-stone, it would be impossible to fix the historical sequence in the "account of the journey."

S. John's Gospel, if only for the reason of its external order, takes a high place among the sources of information concerning the life of Jesus. About the early history, indeed, it is completely silent, and only here and there betrays any acquaintance therewith. In respect of the works done in Galilee, it but seldom runs parallel with the Synoptics, or does so only for its own purposes. But of the works done by Jesus in Jerusalem and Judæa it gives a fairly comprehensive account. The Synoptists begin the public life of Jesus with the imprisonment of the Baptist. John introduces Jesus as working side by side with him, and consequently shows how the Baptist's disciples turned

18 See Schanz, *Comment. in Luc*, p. 18, 92.

* II. 1; III. 1.

* IV. 16; V. 1.

† Mark vi. 45; viii. 26.

their attention from their master to Jesus. We hear of Jesus discoursing in the Synagogue at Capharnaum, and with a Jewish Rabbi named Nicodemus, and with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well. We hear, for the first time, of the raising of Lazarus from the dead, of sight being restored to the man born blind, and of the cure of the man who had been infirm for eight and thirty years. The frequent disputes in the temple, on festival days, are rehearsed at great length, and the washing of the feet at the last supper is told, although the supper itself is hardly touched upon. The beautiful farewell discourses spoken by Jesus, when surrounded by his disciples, form an integral portion of the second part of S. John's Gospel. Much in the history of the Passion and resurrection is new, and it serves to heighten the glory of the God-man—an end which is kept steadily in view throughout. It might seem quite a new Gospel, did not the afore-mentioned points of contact make it quite clear that it was meant to complete the Synoptics for a definite purpose. The origin of the Gospel, and internal reasons, had already enabled the Fathers to discern this relation to the to the Synoptists. In regard to the fourth Gospel the dependence-hypothesis is generally admitted. To the bearings this admission had on the Synoptic question, we can refer only in passing.

The difference between the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics stands out in stronger relief, when its Christology, and its complete historical conception are taken into account. On both grounds, since the commencement of this century, the authorship of S. John, the Apostle, has been challenged. In the first place, it presents a palpable contrast with the Apocalypse; the difference in style in this last had induced Dionysius of Alexandria to ascribe the Apocalypse to some other John. The Apocalypse was said to favour extreme Judaism, and to be particularistic in character. But the difference in style may be accounted for, in great part, by the prophetic character of the Apocalypse, which adheres to the Hebrew mode of

expression, and for this reason treats the rules of Greek grammar with scant courtesy. On the other hand, however, neither is the Greek of the Gospel pure ; for, although it nowhere comes into collision with grammar, still the simplicity of its structure and the absence of periods are more Hebrew than Greek. It is not difficult to perceive the "Hebrew soul" beneath the Greek style.* Nor can it be shewn that the tendency of the Apocalypse is particularistic. On the contrary, the city of Sion is the point where the blessed of all nations assemble, and the millennium is the union of all peoples. The new universal Jerusalem, not the Old Testament theocracy, is summoned to the banquet of the Lamb. Besides the 144,000 blessed of every tribe of Israel, there is a multitude which no man can number of every race, of all tribes, peoples and languages before the throne and the Lamb. Is not this the same standpoint as that of the Gospel, when it recognizes that there are other sheep, not of this fold, all of whom it wishes to be one ? Even the Christology of the Apocalypse is not foreign to the Gospel. For in the Apocalypse Christ is the beginning of creation ;* he sits on the throne of heaven,† and subdues the world.‡ He is the Lamb of God,§ that leads his own sheep to pastures, and was slain for the sins of all men ;‖ he is clothed with a garment sprinkled with blood, and his name is the "Word of God."** This last phrase alone establishes kinship with the Gospel : "Lamb of God" occurs elsewhere only in the first Epistle of S. Peter. If the author of the Apocalypse has described the *Logos* according to *Wisdom*,†† so does the author of the Gospel. Even criticism must allow that the affinity of the two writings bespeaks the same origin.

19 Aberle, *Einleit.* p. 84. Schanz, *Comm. in Joan.* p. 12.
* iii. 14.
† iv. 2 sq ; v. 1.
‡ vi.
§ vii. 17.
‖ v. 6 ; viii. 12.
** xix. 13.
†† xviii. 14–25.

One difference between the 4th Gospel and the Synoptics, on which much stress is laid, consists in the account of the last supper and, in connection therewith, of the day on which Jesus died. All four Evangelists agree that Jesus was crucified on a Friday in the Passover week. But, according to the Synoptists, it seems that Jesus after eating, as was his custom, the Jewish Pasch with his disciples on the eve of the 15th of Nisan (March), instituted the Eucharist, and was then taken prisoner on the Mount of Olives. Thus the crucifixion would have taken place on the festival day, on the 15th of Nisan. John says nothing about the Jewish Passover, and seems to place the last supper on the evening of the 13th Nisan, and the crucifixion on the eve of the feast, on the 14th Nisan. Is there a contradiction? or is an adjustment possible? The majority of those who think that the two accounts can be reconciled, side with the Synoptists, because their account of the first day of the unleavened bread (on which the Paschal lamb had to be slain), seems to preclude all doubt; and moreover, the Asiatics, in the disputes about Easter, appealed to this usage of the Apostle John, although the Greeks have finally declared against it. The account of the Synoptists (Matthew being taken as the leader), does not preclude an anticipation of the Paschal meal, and the different remarks about working on the day of the crucifixion only make it appear as though it were a complete feast-day. The appeal in the Easter controversy proves nothing to the contrary, as it was a question in regard to fasting, not of celebrating the day of death. In the next place, John relates how the Jews were unwilling to enter Pilate's judgment-hall, lest they should be defiled and prevented from eating the Pasch. Now, it is extremely improbable that by this eating of the Pasch was meant the usual Paschal fare and sacrificial food, and not the Paschal lamb. Again, S. Paul says* that at the time of the Pasch, Christ our Paschal lamb is slain. S. Paul's well-known typical conceptions

* 1 Cor. v. 7.

render it very probable that he viewed Christ as the Paschal lamb of that Passover. Now the slaughtering had to take place on the 14th Nisan. Finally, it would almost be impossible to conceive, why John gave an account so different from the Synoptists as to be almost misleading. A forger would rather have adhered to the customary practice; so the discrepancy, at any rate, tells clearly in favour of the genuineness of the Gospel. The Apostle can only have intended to define more exactly the time at which the event took place. The reasons that induced S. Matthew to narrate the event according to Jewish custom, without exactly specifying the time, no longer existed when S. John wrote his Gospel.

Internal reasons also strongly support S. John's claim to the authorship. True, like the other evangelists, he omits his own name from the Gospel, but he sufficiently discloses his personality by his remarks on his intimate relations with Peter, and with Jesus on whose breast he was privileged to recline. For in the Acts also, Peter and John are generally mentioned together, and the contents likewise markedly point to John as the well-known eye-witness and apostle. The language, character, and anti-Jewish tendency, have been thrown into the scale against him, as evidencing a Gentile Christian of Greek culture; but it has been found that the language is that of a writer who thought in Hebrew. Then, too, the author is so familiar with the Jews' hopes in the Messias, with Jewish worship and the topography of Palestine, that he must have been a Jew born. The anti-Jewish tendency is no argument to the contrary. For, on the one hand, it is not so exclusive as is commonly made out; and on the other, even a Jewish apostle would have ceased, by the end of the first century, to cherish Judaizing tendencies. And a comparison of the first Gospel with the fourth shows that the anti-Jewish tendencies of the Apostles, such as they were, arose from the breach which the Jews, in their guilt, had made with Judaism. That the universalism of Matthew is harsher than that of John may

be safely asserted. For, in Matthew, the Jews figure as the rejected people, while the Gentiles sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. But John leads to pasture first the Jewish flock, and then the other sheep. And how the heart of the writer glows with interest in Judaism!

The author insists that he was an eye witness, and his plea is so clearly supported, both by the details, and the narrative as a whole, that there is no alternative but to adjudge him either an eye-witness or an "accomplished impostor." Now he could not have been either a wilful, or an involuntary impostor. Not the latter; for how could such imposture have assumed the form of a perfect development of tradition? or how is such huge self-deception regarding such weighty issues conceivable? Nor, again, the former, because the facts are dead against such a supposition. For his knowledge of Jewish history and geography, his insight into Jewish ways and opinions, is too exact to be foreign. None but an eye-witness could have described the festival procession and the miraculous cures so graphically, or have brought the disputes so vividly before us, or have drawn such life-like portraits, and told such characteristic anecdotes. The disputes concerning the Messias, that Jesus had with the Jews and the several classes of the people, quiver with life, and are set forth with such historical knowledge and fidelity that we cannot even imagine the writer not to have heard them with his own ears. Even the monotonous uniformity, and the oft-repeated ideas and phrases cannot impair the lively sketches that the writer has left of Jesus, and the Apostles, and the people; rather they give the impression that nothing but long acquaintance could have imparted to him such bold assurance. The fourth Gospel, indeed, assigns to Jesus a wider sphere of action. But this fact, far from militating against the authorship of an eye-witness, forms a welcome supplement to the Synoptists, who, in foretelling the woes of Jerusalem, and in the account of the journey, had already hinted at this larger sphere of action. The fact that John's Gospel is the complement of

the Synoptic Gospels shivers to pieces every objection from his supposed extension of history.

John shows that he was conversant with the Synoptic account of the Baptism, the entry into Galilee, the choosing of the Apostles, the promise made to Peter, and the institution of the Eucharist; but, having his own purpose and scope in view, he travels far beyond the beaten track. "Without the Synoptic "history, the fourth Gospel is a fleshless phantom; but if they "are presupposed, its gaps and imperfections are justi-"fied".[20] "The Synoptic story, as a whole, is the safe founda-"tion of the fourth Gospel." Or, in the language of the Fathers, John saw that the Synoptists had set forth the human element (Somatic) in the life of Jesus, and he, therefore, wished to complete it by blending with it the divine (Pneumatic) element. But there remains a still deeper reason for this difference.

John's whole conception is said to be at variance with that of the Synoptists. John's portrait of Christ, it is said, is out and out different from the historical portrait; it is ideal and supernatural. It is an abstraction from the idea of the *Logos*. The author begins his Gospel with it, and he proposes to develop it as he proceeds. There is, we are told, no life, no development in this heavenly figure. Jesus is neither born nor baptized; he neither struggles nor suffers. All is ready-made from the beginning, and artificial devices are employed to unfold the plot and bring about the denouement. And, indeed, who would not worship this sublime, supernatural, heavenly figure in the fourth Gospel? Who would not admire his glory? We have seen his glory, says the Evangelist, the glory as it were of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. All he aims at, in his Gospel, is to depict this glory in word and deed, in miracles and prophecy, in suffering, death and resurrection. Now, is not this picture of Jesus, a figure removed from earth, quite different from that in the Synoptists, in which we can see and feel, and as it were, touch him with our hands,

20 Weizsaecker, *Neue Untersuchungen*, Gotha 1864, p. 270.

and in which his discourses are alive with wisdom? It would, indeed, we answer, be another Christ, if in the human and earthly view of the Synoptists there were nothing of the divine side. But neither is this supposition correct. John's main statement is: The Word was made flesh. He records the prophecy of the death and resurrection, makes Jesus hunger and thirst, eat and drink, take part in the marriage at Cana, lodge at Bethany, and sit down tired at Jacob's well. And even after he had risen, he bade Thomas: "Put in thy finger hither, and see my "hands, and bring hither thy hand and put it into my "side."* How, then, can John be said to have denied the human nature, idealized it, or made too little of it?

Ncr is a certain historical development in the fourth Gospel wanting, but we must not measure it exactly by the Synoptic standard (though in Luke, the boy Jesus, when twelve years old, shows forth a flash of divine wisdom). It was in no way the intention of the Synoptists to make Jesus come forth as if he had been, at first, unconscious of his Messianic calling, and only gradually awake to the fact that in Jerusalem he must either conquer or die. The sermon on the Mount in Matthew, and Mark's account of the miracles, indicate that he is the great prophet. The old and new garment, the old and new wine, the lordship of the Son of Man over the Sabbath, the forgiveness of sins, are patent symbols of his Messianic office, and of his divine origin; and they supply a transition to John, in whose Gospel, the Son of Man, the Sabbath, and the forgiveness of sins alike occupy a conspicuous place. True, John goes farther still. Already at his first meeting with the disciples, Jesus manifests his omniscience; he knows all, and needs not that any should give testimony of men. He at once sets about purifying the temple, and denouncing the Jews. But did not the Baptist say, and do the same?† Are not the miracles in Galilee evidence of the Messias? True, in John,‡

* John xx. 20–27. Cfr. xix. 84. I. John i. 1.

† Matt. iii. 9.

‡ John ii. 19 and iii. 14.

Jesus twice refers, at a very early time, to his death and resurrection. But to the first reference, there is a parallel in Mark,* and as to the second, the prophecy was so obscure that the disciples understood it not till it had been fulfilled. They needed a long training before they understood Jesus,† and were fully convinced.‡ Mark,§ too, tells how the Jews at an early period, consulted together to destroy Jesus. Both internally and externally, an historical development manifests itself in the doctrine, in the attitude of Jesus to the Jews, and in the change of scene. Though the temptation and the struggle in Gethsemane are passed over, other internal struggles are not wanting.‖ So much for the first objection.

Miracles, it is said, are miracles; they are mighty works transcending all nature, and are signs of God's Almighty power. Now it would seem that John almost intentionally tries to heighten the nature of the various maladies and diseases.** Hence his miracles are horribly unnatural in character. The entire human envelope has vanished from Jesus.†† One, he cures without visible necessity; another he allows to die in order to raise him up again;‡‡ and a third is born blind for the very purpose that the glory of God may be made manifest in him! All this is very true. But, we ask in turn, are not the miracles worked by Jesus part and parcel of God's providence over man's destiny? Must not everything, wittingly or unwittingly, conduce to the glory of God? Why, then, should it seem foolish for God to succour man in his needs by miraculous food; or that the man born blind should be an instrument in the hand of Divine Providence; or that sickness should bring Lazarus into the grave, in order that the arm of the Almighty might

* xiv. 5. 8.
† Ibid. vi. 69.
‡ iii. 6.
§ xvi. 30.
‖ John xi. 33; xiv. 30; xviii. 11.
** c. vi.
†† Ibid iv. 47; v. 2; ix. 1; xi. 39.
‡‡ c. xi.

lead him forth? It was by this means that faith in the Son of God and the Redeemer of the world was planted and took root. John, deliberately and of set purpose, in pursuance of his higher aims, relates only such miracles as were striking, because he supposes his readers to be acquainted with the Synoptic miracles. But he does not dissociate them from the divine economy of Jesus, that is, man's salvation. At Cana he helped the bridal party in their distress, and lovingly heard the prayer of the chief for his son who was sick unto death. The man who had been infirm for eight-and-thirty years is indeed asked, whether he wished to be cured; but is the cure therefore "unnaturally" forced upon him? Mark too relates a similar instance.* The man born blind, when healed, was full to overflowing with gratitude to his benefactor; and the scene at the raising of Lazarus is such a touching manifestation of heartfelt friendship and love, that it would scarcely be possible to give a more powerful illustration of the way in which the God-man combined in himself the feelings of man and the will of God. We next come to the discourses which give most colour to John's portrait of Christ. Both in form and matter alike there are difficulties. The bond of union between them is as closely knit, as the distinction between them and the animated practical utterances in the Synoptists are broad.

And this applies not merely to the discourses of Jesus, but also to those of the Baptist; and both fit in with the general character of the Gospel and of the Epistles. But the remarkable agreement between the discourses of Jesus and those of the Baptist is not without its analogy in the Synoptists.† If John was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb;‡ if he was greater than all men born of woman;§ if he was led by the Spirit into the desert,‖ it

* iii. 1.

† Matth. iii. 2; iv. 17.

‡ Luke i. 15.

§ Math. xi. 11.

‖ Luke iii. 2.

is not unlikely that his prophetic instinct led him to think of Jesus as highly as he spoke. John's portrait of the austere preacher of penance is not, indeed, the same as the Synoptic portrait; but of him as of Jesus John has drawn not an exoteric but an esoteric likeness. Of the Baptist's relations with the disciples the Snyoptists are silent, and yet there is a *prima facie* probability that the voice of one crying in the wilderness had found an echo in the hearts of the simple pious Galileans. John iii. 27–35 shows the transition to the Baptist of the Synoptists. If here the style is the style of John, in the Synoptists it is the style of the Synoptists, though this latter, being so simple, is naturally less striking. The disputes in Matthew* are, in tone and character, decidedly akin to Christ's discourses in John.

Again, the question as to the observance of the Sabbath occupies a conspicuous position both in John and in the Synoptists. As in the Synoptists Jesus seems to avoid giving a direct answer, and pays more heed to the thoughts than to the words, so in John, he reads the heart, and to the astonishment and confusion of his hearers, replies rather to the thoughts than the words. Now if John, to serve his purpose, wished to recount the disputations which Jesus frequently held with learned Jews in Jerusalem, his manner and style of narrative would necessarily reveal points of difference with other accounts. For surely, in these disputes, Jesus would have revealed the higher side of his wisdom; and who was more fitted to give it formal expression than the beloved disciple? Though an attentive listener to the many discourses in Aramaic, he could give but a digest. For several decades of years he had pondered over them in his contemplative mind, and had made them his own. And yet how closely he kept to tradition, is shewn by a few striking remarks† here and there on the sense of Christ's

* c. xxii.

† vi. 49; viii. 20; x. 22; xiv. 31.

words, and on the understanding of the hearers. Both the form and substance of the discourse seem to indicate the original. A slight instance of both in the Synoptists is given in S. Matthew.*[21]

But it is further alleged that the idea of the Logos, which he borrowed from Greek Philosophy or Philonism, has provided the author with the materials for his discourses. That the popular philosophy then in fashion prompted John to expound the Logos, is hardly deniable; but that he borrowed the Idea from Greek Philosophy we unhesitatingly deny. To Philo, and still more to Greek Philosophy, a personal, incarnate Logos was unknown. It was the Sapiential Books of the Old Testament, and they alone, which contained in germ the hypostatic conception of wisdom; and that germ, in conjunction with the prophecies, could be developed into the portrait of a living personal Logos, when once that Logos had in reality appeared. Had not John recognized the Word as made Flesh, he could not have modelled his grand introduction on the Old Testament. It is, however, only in the Prologue, that the idea of the Logos occurs, although the word of God as revealed is repeatedly mentioned.† John never puts the term 'Logos' in Jesus' mouth. In chapters xii. and xx. the Logos would have been mentioned, if the intention had existed to make the idea of the Logos the object of the narrative. The Logos is indeed the daughter but not the mother of the discourses; the consequence not the antecedent. The Logos is introduced as something with which the reader is perfectly acquainted, and serves as a preparation for the proper scope of the Gospel. In the discourses, Christ appears as the Anointed, the Ambassador of the Father, the one who came down from heaven. But the Synoptists do the same. Nay more, out of regard for Jewish monotheism, they emphasize his dependence on the Father.‡

21 Schanz, *Comm. in Math.* p. 27. Keppler, *Unseres Herrn Trost.* Frieb. 1887, p. 6.

* xi. 25-30.

† v. 38; viii. 55; x. 35; xvii. 6. 14. 7.

‡ Matt. xi. 25; xxviii. 18; Luke x. 21, 27 and 30. 31.

The Synoptists give prominence to the discourses which Jesus held before the people concerning the Kingdom of God; while John records those which centre in the person of Jesus. We cannot suppose that Jesus required no faith in his person,* or that he appeared only to the Apostle Paul, and not to the beloved disciples, as an object of faith. Christ is, in fact, the revealer and the object of revelation. He who confesses him not before men, him neither will Christ confess before his Father who is in heaven. On this very point of eternal life John agrees with the Synoptists.† Again the entrance into the Kingdom of God is mentioned by John.‡ The eschatological teaching stands somewhat in the background, but it is not wholly absent. Judgment and the resurrection are taught§; and a certain prospect of the last day is also held out. Mansions are prepared for the disciples in the Father's house. Union of soul with the Father and Son, by means of the Holy Spirit, is a condition and a foretaste of the eternal life to come. The disciples are neither of, nor for this world. The Spirit of the Father comforts them in trial and sufferings, enlightens them and is at their side; just as the Synoptists represent it.

Lastly, we have to consider the parables, of which examples are not wanting in John. There is the vine and the branches, the good shepherd and the hireling, the sheep and the wolf. The Synoptic discourses, however, as well as the parables proper, are symbolical in language; and the parables in the account of the journey, show how Jesus passed from parables to symbolism. The Jews are represented as not understanding these parabolic or symbolic discourses, because their works were evil; while the disciples, being men of goodwill, began by degrees to understand their master's meaning. They believed, and the writer of the fourth Gospel being a believer, wishes to propagate the

* Matth. xi. 25; xxviii. 18; Luke x. 21.

† Matth. xviii. 3-8; xix. 17; xxiii. 25-34-46.

‡ iii. 5.

§ c. V. vi.

same faith. Is it conceivable, then, that he deliberately invented discourses, and that so clumsily, as to contradict the Synoptic discourses, and to be unintelligible and repulsive to faith? Would he have been able with such discourses, to lay a foundation for faith? Could he have confirmed the faith of others, acquainted with the Synoptists, by such novel ideas as "being born again of water and the Spirit," "adoration in spirit and truth," the "virtue of the Paraclete," the "unity between Father and Son"? Surely the portrait of Christ, drawn by John, must bear the stamp of divine truth on its brow, if it has met with general belief, and enthusiastic reception, even though its first and only opponents, the *Alogoi* (who lived in the country in which the Gospel first saw the light), maintained that it was untrue; that it contradicted the other gospels; that its order of events was notoriously false; that it was utterly orderless; that it omitted what was important, and that its additions were in contradiction with facts.[23] Unless its Apostolic origin had been generally admitted such a strange Gospel would never have met with an enthusiastic welcome. The small number of Alogoi, who, unlike the Montanists, were opposed on dogmatic grounds to John's writings, could neither hinder its recognition, nor disprove the statement that, despite all objections, the difficulties of concordance were best solved by the fact that the Gospel was of Apostolic origin. The "great unknown" to whom the school of criticism assigns the Gospel, is sought in vain in the history of the second century. And still he must have had great authority and extensive erudition! None but an Apostle could give a dazzling picture of the power and majesty of him who had overcome the world; none but an Apostle and eye-witness could have drawn the truth from the bosom of the God-man, and created therefrom an immortal work, a well-spring of faith and piety. Such a completion, in which the more human element of the Synoptists becomes transfigured by the divine

23 Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 568.

element of Christ, was necessary to crown the work of the Gospel and the work of Christ!

About the scope of the Gospel, only a few more words need be said. The first purpose has already been described, namely to give a higher and an internal completion to the Gospel narratives. Controversy with Cerinthus and the Nicolaites or other Gnostic heretics was certainly not a direct object. The narrative is more didactic than polemical or apologetic. Still less can it be regarded as having immediate reference to Philo. Anti-Judaism is certainly not its chief purpose. All these elements, so far as they appear, are subordinated to proving the Christ to be the Messias and God, and that by faith in his name the reader is to attain eternal life.[23]

If on external and internal grounds the authors of our Gospels are Apostles and their disciples, then the Gospels, even apart from their inspiration, are worthy of the highest authority for a life of Jesus. The character of the authors precludes fraud; deception in good faith was impossible in men who sacrificed their lives in Christ's service. Again, their simple faithfulness in writing appears from the fact that they never spare the disciples. All their weaknesses and imperfections, their misunderstandings and exaggerations, their unbelief and little faith, their hopes and illusions are shown up with a candour and a naiveté that enables us to see clearly the whole soul of the writers. "The disciples have recorded the malice of the Jews against "Jesus with loving truthfulness and singleness of purpose, in not "eliminating from the wonderful history anything that seems to "be a reproach to Christian doctrine. For neither Jesus nor "the disciples wished men so to believe in his miracles and "divinity as if he had not made human nature his own, and "taken to himself the flesh which in man lusts against the spirit."[24] When Pascal says that he is unaware whether this has been remarked before, the numerous allusions of the

23 Schanz, *Comment. ad l.* p. 47.
24 Orig., *c. Cels.*, III. 28. Pascal, xvi. 3. Rousseau, *Emile* iv.

Fathers must have escaped his notice. Intellectually speaking, the minds of these simple men, if left to themselves, would have have been unequal to preaching and writing the Gospel of the Son of God, which was so far beyond the range of Jewish ideas at that time. In truth, as even Rousseau observes, the inventors of the stories must have been greater than their hero. It would have been impossible in historical times, in the first century and shortly after Jesus' death, for poetry and mythology to have adorned simple faith so liberally with fancy, and at the same time to have strictly preserved historical accuracy amid admirable simplicity. The Gospels are without this very adornment or rather disfigurement. If we are to believe no Gospel but that preached by the Apostles, we shall hold fast to the faith of the early Church, and of the whole Church. St. Augustine says: "I would not believe the Gospel, did not the "authority of the Church move me thereto."

Nevertheless, from their more or less accidental origin, and their relations one to another, it must be concluded that the Gospels were not intended to give a complete abstract of the life of Jesus,* and that the Evangelists maintained reserve about many of the details. Being written for believers they pre-suppose a knowledge of faith, and pursue definite ends. If in preaching, pearls were not to be cast before swine,† in writing the danger of abuse necessitated still greater prudence. "Be ye therefore," said our Lord, "wise as serpents and simple as doves."‡ There are allusions to this in the Epistles.§ Our Lord Himself had not revealed all.[25] "The grace of God," "says Origen, instructed the Apostles to write one thing and "how to write, and otherwise not to write at all for the multi- "tude; to preach some things from the housetops, and to be

25 John xvi. 12. Cf. Aug., *de Sermon. in Monte* II. 20, 67 (ad Math. vii. 6). Orig., *c. Cels.* vi. 6. *In Math.* xvi. 14, cf. *c. Cels.* I. 42.

* John xx: 30; xxi. 25.

† Matth vii. 6;

‡ x. 16.

§ II. John x. 2; I. Cor. xi. 17-34-22.

"silent as to others." "Hence it is of great importance, in such "passages of the Gospel, to attend to the will and intention of "the writers; to see for what purpose, they recorded the works "of our Redeemer, both those that are, and those that are not "miraculous and extraordinary."

CHAPTER XVI.

THE LIFE OF JESUS.

The life of Jesus is its own most effective apology. As the old adage says, words teach but example draws. Plato's ideal man had one radical fault,—he was unreal. That very ideal, however, and the longing after it, so far as it exists in the human mind and heart, is proof that man was made from a divine pattern, and for a nobler and higher destiny. But this image has been defaced almost past recognition. The world stands in need of redemption, but it seeks in vain an image at once new and real by which to satisfy its desires and aspirations, and give life and strength to its thought and will. Even the prophet, whom the Spirit of God enabled to draw in lines of light the portrait of the perfect servant of God, the Man of Sorrows,* was constrained to look to the future for its realization. Not until the long promised one, the desired of nations shall have come, will a new stream of life begin to flow. What is this *real ideal*, this image according to which man was created, and is now born again? It is none other than Jesus of Nazareth, whose life and conversation were among men, teaching them the way that leads to life. In a sinful world he stands without a sin. In a world, cold, unfeeling and selfish, his heart glows with love; his mildness allays the keenest griefs, and his mercy dries the welling founts of bitter tears. He came to seek and to save that which was lost. Like a good shepherd he goes in

* Isaias xiii. 1. 9. 53.

search of the lost sheep of the house of Israel; he heals the sick in body and soul, rebukes not when rebuked, and when he suffers threatens not; and at last, he dies on the shameful wood, the death of a malefactor, nailing our sins to the tree. One of the last words he spoke was: "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do"* Who can say with Jesus: "Learn of me, for I am meek "and humble of heart?" "If any one will come after "me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and fol- "low me."† What an example is this that Christ has left us! The redeemer bore the cross and, though innocent, died on it between two malefactors! Who, with a model so sublime before his eyes, would not be comforted in suffering, strengthened in conflict, encouraged in death. We have not a high priest, who cannot have compassion on our infirmities; but one tempted in all things like as we are, without sin. He was heard for his reverence; he learned obedience by suffering, and became to all that obey him the cause of eternal salvation.‡

Jesus' example worked great results. The disciples trod in their master's footsteps, and took up their cross, renouncing the world with its riches and pleasures. Save Jesus, to whom they were inseparably attached, they esteemed all things as refuse. Their lives were spent in imitating Christ. Our Lord himself foretold to the rock of his Church, to whom he entrusted the care of his sheep, that he should follow him, and that another should gird him, and lead him whither he would not. Like his master he suffered and died; but he also imitated Christ inwardly, and in spirit. To this spiritual imitation the example of his master, whom in a weak moment he had denied, spurred him on, and by way of consolation he proposed to the imitation of the faithful that by which he himself had been drawn and carried away. "If doing well you suffer patiently—this is thanks- "worthy before God. For unto this are you called,

* Matt. xi. 29.

† Ibid xvi. 24.

‡ Hebr. iv. 15; v. 7 and 10.

"because Christ also suffered for us, leaving you an example that you should follow his steps."* "For it is better doing well (if such be the will of God) to suffer, than doing ill. Because Christ also died once for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might offer us to God."† To S. Paul, who had not known our Lord in the flesh, the day seemed thrice blessed on which he was first able to exhort the faithful to imitate Christ. He knew none but Christ and him crucified; he follows Christ, and the faithful, too, must follow him. Having been baptized with Christ they must die to sin, and rise again with him to a new life of justice and holiness. They must lift up their eyes to where Christ sits at the right hand of the Father.

We should never make an end did we attempt to set forth, even partially, what our suffering redeemer has openly accomplished in holy souls. And how much is hidden from sight! We would add only one more consideration. After Pascal has shown the one-sided character even of the greatness of men of intellect and learning, and wisdom, and holiness, he sketches on this background the following portrait of Jesus: "Jesus Christ, without wealth or any external scientific attainments, is great in the order of holiness. He invented nothing; he was not a ruler; but he was humble, patient, holy in God's sight, terrible to the devils, and without sin. Oh, in what pomp and royal magnificence he came, to the eyes of the heart that see wisdom." "Let us then receive with open arms our deliverer who, promised for 4,000 years, at length came on earth to suffer and die for us, at that time and under those circumstances which had been foretold. And while by his grace we peacefully await death, hoping to be united with him for ever, we still would gladly live, either amid the good that he graciously gives us, or amid the evil things that he

1 Pensées xiv. 1, 13.
* I. Peter ii. 20.
† Ibid. iii. 17.

"sends us for our good, and which he has taught us by "his example to bear."

Our only purpose in this picture is to awaken interest in the life of Jesus. By and bye we shall examine the portrait more in detail. But just now we purpose to sketch some of the outlines of the life of Jesus; premising that, as exact data cannot always be had, we shall often have to rest content with an approximation. And first, in regard to the year of his birth,[a] the Gospels furnish data that are partly direct and partly indirect. The direct data are given by Luke* and Matthew.† Our information respecting the census under Quirinus is not historically certain. Neither the exegetical (πρώτη = before) nor the historical reasons are sufficient ground for supposing this enrolling to be identical with that mentioned in Acts v. 37. It is, however, demonstrable that Quirinus was in the East about the year 751 or 752, and probably earlier. Hence, on this score, there is nothing that stands in the way of fixing the date accurately. Enrollings under Augustus, especially after the year 746, were frequent. According to Matthew,‡ Jesus was born in the days of Herod.§ After Herod's death he returned from Egypt.‖ The death of Herod, apart from the length of his reign (34 or 37 years, from 714 or 717 onwards), is determined pretty closely by an eclipse of the moon recorded by Josephus as having taken place just before Herod's death. Now, according to astronomical calculations, one eclipse took place in 750, and another in 753. Thus only between these two years, and not 751, does the choice lie. In spite of recent attempts by Caspari and Riess to assign the death of Herod to 753, and to show the calculation of the Christian era by Dionysius Exiguus to be correct, it is histori-

a See *Kirchenlexicon* III. 335. Friedlieb, *Leben Jesu*, p. 287. See also the commentaries to the passages.

* II. 1.

† II. 1.

‡ V. 37.

§ II. 1.

‖ Ibid II. 19.

cally certain that Herod died at the Easter of 750. But as the presentation in the temple, the coming of the wise men, and the Flight into Egypt, must have happened before his death, the beginning of the year 750 or the end of 749 must be set down as the year of Our Lord's birth. A conjunction of the planets, Jupiter, Saturn and Mars was observed in 1603, and in the year following a new star joined them. Now, since Kepler's time, many learned men have explained the star of the wise men by a similar conjunction that took place in 747, and have accepted the year 748,* or 747 † itself, as the year in which the star appeared to the wise men. If we regard the two years mentioned in v. 16 as exact dates, we may add two years more.

The indirect data serve to define the year more approximately. According to calculations taken from the priestly course of Abia, to which Zachary belonged,‡ the appearance of the angel Gabriel would have taken place in the October of 748; and this would fix the birth of Jesus on January 9th, 750. But, besides the uncertainty as to whether the appearance was in the spring or the autumn, it is very questionable whether, after the Captivity, the order between the twenty-four classes of priests was strictly observed. Luke§ tells us that Jesus was about thirty years old when he was baptised. But, as‖ the Baptist began his public career in the sixteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar (from August 19th, 767) the thirtieth year of Jesus would be 781 or 782. The Fathers also reckoned from this date, the 41st** or 42nd†† year of the reign of Augustus, which began on August 19th, 711. From this Dionysius (500 A.D.) inferred that the year 753 was the

* Kepler.

† Sanclemente, Ideler. Huschke, Patrizi, Zumpt, Sepp, &c.

‡ Luke I. 5.

§ III. 23.

‖ III. 1.

** Irenæus, Tertullian, Cassiodorus,

†† Eusebius, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Orosius.

year of Jesus' birth, and that consequently 754 was the first year of the Christian era. But this calculation cannot be reconciled with the date of Herod's death. Hence the reign of Tiberius has been computed from the time, mentioned by Roman writers, when he was associated with Augustus in the Empire. Now, as the reign of Augustus may be computed in four ways, and the reign of Herod in two, this mode of computing the reign of Tiberius may, by analogy, be applied to the time when provinces were assigned to him. His association in the government dates probably from 765 (766), and thus his fifteenth year would be 779 (780.) This would give 749 or 750 as the year of our Lord's birth. Lastly, the Jews state that the temple, that is the Herodian temple, had been forty-six years building. It was begun in 734 or 735; and as the words were spoken at Easter, it would be Easter 780 (781.) Consequently our Lord's baptism falls in the spring of 780 (781), or in the autumn of 780. So we have again veered round to the year 750 or 749, which may, therefore, with great probability be set down as the year of Christ's birth.

Having determined as approximately as may be the year, it now remains to fix the day. To attempt to build a theory merely upon the Scripture data would be a bold undertaking, and Clement of Alexandria may well have stood aghast thereat. Antipater, Herod's eldest son, was executed five day's before his father's death. And Macrobius, in his account of the execution, seems to hint that the children of Bethlehem were also murdered shortly before Herod's death. If this be so, then all previous incidents in the life of the divine child must have happened either in the beginning of 750 or at the end of 749. Now when the Magi came, Herod was still in Jerusalem, but he went to Jericho in the middle of February; so the birth will have taken place towards the beginning of the year. A calculation based on the aforementioned order of priests will give June the 10th as the birthday of the Baptist. A Jewish tradition embodied in the Talmud fixes Christ's birthday in Decem-

ber. Clement gives as alternate dates November the 17th, April the 19th or 20th, and May the 21st; and he relates that the Basilidians, celebrated the Nativity on the 10th or the 6th of January. Later on, the Syrians and the Greeks clung with tenacity to January the 6th. Certainly, from the middle of the 4th century, the Feast of the Nativity has been celebrated on December 25th; and since 376 the Greeks also have observed this date. In the Easter Cycle of Hippolytus the Incarnation is assigned to the 25th of March; and in the Apostolic constitutions (5. 13) the 25th of December is set down as the feast of the Nativity.[3]

We have next to enquire as to the duration of our Lord's public ministry. Its exact duration can be gathered only from S. John's Gospel. The Synoptists mention but one Easter—that of the passion; and this, together with a one sided interpretation of the "acceptable year,"* gave rise to the opinion, which prevailed till Augustine's time, that the public life of Jesus lasted for only one year.[4] This assumption, tacked on to the statement about the fifteenth year of Tiberius, led the oldest chronologists to set down the Passion to the year 782 (29 A.D.) or, allowing a full year, to 783 (30 A.D.).[5] Eusebius, while adopting this year in his Chronicle, supposes, in his Ecclesiastical History, the year to be 785 (32 A.D.), that is the nineteenth year of the *Chronicon Paschale*. But, on the other hand, the Synoptists allude clearly and unmistakably to Jesus' visiting Jerusalem for several festivals.† The plucking of the ears of corn on the second first Sabbath‡ must be put after Easter and

3 See Riess, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*, Freiburg, 1880, p. 204. Freidleib, p. 313. Kellner, *Die Regierungszeit des Herodes und ihre Dauer*, in *Katholik*, 1887, II. 1, 2, places the death of Herod in the year 751.

4 The Gnostics, the Alogi, Julius Africanus, Clement of Alex., Tertullian, Origen, Pseudo-Cyprian, Lactantius, Philastrius, Gaudentius, Augustine, Evagrius.

5 Clement of Alex., Julius Africanus, Epiphanius, Julius Hilarion. See Lipsius, *Apocryphe Apostelgeschichten*, II. 1, p. 27.

* Luke iv. 19.

† Matth. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34; xix. 42.

‡ Luke vi. 1.

the harvest feast; here, then, are two Easters at least. In Luke's account of the journey,* the three years might perhaps be taken as referring to the three years of Jesus' ministry. If to this we add the three references to his journeys to Jerusalem,† we are not far off the correct calculation.

John mentions three passovers during our Lord's public life‡—a fact which Irenæus urged against the Valentinians who allowed only one year for our Lord's public ministry. True, in his own peculiar way, he concluded from viii, 57 "Thou art not yet "fifty years old," that Jesus was between 40 and 50 years of age. Chrysostom, too, thought that Christ was nearly forty.[6] To this view no objection can be lodged from S. John's Gospel, as John makes no mention either of Christ's birth or baptism. But as the fourth Gospel presupposes the Synoptists, the three passovers must be calculated from our Lord's thirtieth year. The foregoing passage in which the Jews hazard a conjecture as to Jesus' age, proves nothing; for the antithesis between a jubilee-period and the time that had expired since Abraham's death, was quite accidental. In the fourth Gospel § another feast is mentioned as occasioning the second journey of Jesus to Jerusalem. So far this feast has not been identified. Easter, Tabernacles and Pentecost have been in turn adopted. But now the weight of authority inclines to the Purim festival.[7] The popular and noisy character of the rejoicings on this feast seem, indeed, ill-suited to a visit of Jesus; but the internal reasons against each of the chief feasts are not to be lightly set aside. John regularly mentions the chief feasts by name, and never simply designates them feasts, unless his meaning is unmistakable from the context.‖ Even if the designation **

6 *Commentar. in Joan.* p. 361.
7 *Ib.*, p. 230, 599.
* Ibid. xiii 7.
† Ibid. ix. 51; xiii. 22; xvii. 11
‡ II. 13; vi. 4; xii. 1.
§ v. 1.
‖ iv. 45.
** v. 16

were supplemented by the definite article, it would still be surprising that this should be the only place in which S. John does not mention the Passover by name.* Many of the events recorded by the Synoptists must have happened in the interval between this Passover and the following.† Not that we lay any special stress on this; but the omission of the whole section is, to say the least, remarkable. If, in spite of this, it is still urged that one of the three great feasts is meant, it must be the Passover; for Tabernacles is mentioned in vii. 2, and Pentecost is not alluded to at all. So, if the verdict is given in favour of Easter, our Lord's public life will have lasted about three years and a half instead of two and a half. Of course, a great festival might be simply passed over; but in view of the marked emphasis laid on the Easter festival, such an omission is scarcely probable. Origen supposes that the public ministry lasted about three years, but he does not definitely commit himself to the statement. Eusebius, in his ecclesiastical history, and Jerome compute about three years and a half, and S. Augustine, from an analysis of the events in our Lord's life, draws the same conclusion.[8]

The biographer is beset by still greater difficulties in attempting to give a complete sketch of Jesus' life. Outside the history of the infancy, we know nothing of the "hidden life of Jesus," except his journey to Jerusalem at the age of twelve, and the finding in the temple. And even in the infancy, the insertion of the visit of the magi and of the other events till the flight into Egypt after the presentation in the temple, has its difficulties; although they can hardly have happened before. The public ministry may be determined by certain great landmarks, which, however, furnish indirect bases of calculation rather than direct chronological data. This material

8 *In Math.* Scr. 40 (III. 859). *C. Cels.* II. 12. Aug., *de doctr. christ.* II. 42. See *Commentar. zu Lukas*, p. 186.

* ii. 13; vi. 4.

† vi. 4.

co-ordination of events, which no one disputes in Matthew, and which is also unmistakable in the other Evangelists, is better adapted than a mere chronological order for a religious and apologetic purpose. This is especially true of the discourses, disputations and miracles.

S. John's Gospel also supplies the chief landmarks. It sets forth the relations of Jesus with the Baptist; it gives an account of the first disciples, of the appearance of Jesus in the temple, of his discourse with Nicodemus, of the question that arose among the disciples regarding his baptism. The changing of water into wine is expressly set down as the first miracle that Jesus did. In c. iii. v. 4 the imprisonment of the Baptist, with which the Synoptists open their history of the public ministry, is distinctly stated to have not yet taken place. In c. iv. v. 1 a further reason is assigned for Jesus' journey to Galilee; and here John takes the opportunity of relating Jesus' dealings with the Samaritans.* Again, the historical date given in c. vi. v. 4 enables us to fix the miraculous multiplication of the loaves, and the subsequent discourse in the synagogue at Capharnaum gives us an insight into the success that attended his work in Galilee. Here, then, we may find the starting-point of the narrative of the Synoptists.† Moreover, if the plucking of the ears of corn‡ were placed in its proper chronological sequence, and if, furthermore, the feast mentioned in John vi. 1 were a Passover, then the interval between the second and third Passover would be filled in; the miraculous feeding and the subsequent narrative of the Synoptists would have to be set before John vii.; and the incidents mentioned in "the journey" would probably run parallel with John viii. 1; x. 22; xii. 1. From John x. 40 we may, perhaps, suppose that Jesus joined the festival caravan at Jericho. The anointing in Bethania as described in xii. 1 is an aid to reading the account

* See Luke x. 35 seq; xvii. 11 seq.

† Mark vi. 34 seq.

‡ Ibid. iii. 23.

of the Synoptists in the right light, and also fixes the event as near the time of the Passover. Like the other Evangelists, however, John is often content to indicate the sequence of details with the general phrase: "after this."

The above-mentioned differences are also conspicuous in the history of the Passion. Thus in c. xii. it is difficult to find the exact joint where the Synoptic narrative fits in. Here we may say with S. Augustine: The history of each Evangelist is so arranged as if nothing were omitted. Verse 21 suggests a connecting link, but, if Judas partook of the Holy Eucharist, its institution must be placed before v. 30. The beautiful parting discourses and the Pontifical prayer enable us to realize the loving intercourse that subsisted between master and disciples. Henceforth the disciples are not servants but friends. What a comfort in that sad hour must not these words have been as they welled forth from the inmost depths of Christ's infinite wisdom and love! What a consolation, too, to know the treatment the world had in store for them! to be assured of the protection of the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete! and to know the eternal reward that awaited them in heaven! In truth our own fancy would have conjured up exactly such a picture of the last moments spent by Jesus with his disciples, had not John, in his own inimitable way, recorded his own feelings and impressions at that solemn hour.

To describe the course of events in the history of the Passion would be but to repeat what is known to all. The Mount of Olives, Gethsemani, the High-priests Annas and Caiphas, Pilate and Golgotha are familiar to all, as are also the various stages of mockery, insult, and cruelty that Jesus had to pass in order to redeem sinners and reconcile the world with God. Jesus, the innocent Lamb of God led to the slaughter, opened not his mouth except to ask pardon for his murderers, and to promise paradise to the penitent thief. In truth, said the centurion, this man was the just one, the Son of God.

And now, in what year did Jesus die? As to the day of the

week, the Evangelists are all agreed that it was the day of preparation (Parasceve, παρασκευάζειν), the day preceding the Sabbath. But, as we said when discussing the date of the last supper, the day of the month is more doubtful. Was it the 14th or 15th of Nisan? Was it, that is, fourteen or fifteen days after the vernal "full moon," according to which the Jewish Easter was regulated? The calculations upon this head are not absolutely certain, and astronomical accuracy is out of the question. Hence the results vary with the hypotheses. According to the calculations of Wurm, which are now generally accepted, the 15th of Nisan thrice fell on a Friday between the years 781 and 787: in 783 (April 7th 30 A.D.), in leap year 784 (April 26th 31 A.D.), and in 787 (April 23rd 34 A.D.). Each of these three dates has found writers to advocate its claims. Many chronologists have adopted April 7th 30 A.D.;[9] others, not having confidence in the astronomical calculations, or unwilling to take the Synoptical data as a basis, consider the year 29 A.D. more probable;[10] while others again prefer the years 31, 33, or even 34 A.D.[11] According to the elaborate mathematical tables constructed by Riess, the 15th of Nisan fell on Wednesday April 6th in 783, and on Friday, April 3rd in 786. The year 782 and 783, however, will always remain the more likely; the former to those who take the fourth Gospel, the latter to those who take the Synoptists as a basis.

Many Fathers, following in the wake of Tertullian, founding their opinion, however, not on tradition, but upon a calculation based on the fourteenth year of Tiberius, fixed on the consulship of the Gemini, i.e. 782. Thus, according to them Christ, died on March 25th.[12] Augus-

9 Wieseler, Lichtenstein, Chavannes, Schegg, J. Grimm, Caspari, Rotermund, Noesgen, Friedlieb, Schurer, and others.

10 Patrizzi, Sepp, Zoekler, Schulze, Cornely, and others.

11 31 Anger, Meyer, Ljungberg, Beyschlag, and others. 33 Oppert, Hase, Lutterbeck, Riess, etc. 33 or 34 Volkmar; 35 Keim, Hausrath.

12 Tertull., *Adv Jud.* c. 8. Lactant., *Inst.* iv. 10. Chrysost., *Serm. de nat. S. Joan. Bapt.* Gregor. Tur. 10 cap ult. Beda, *de rat. temp.* c. 47. Philocalus. ap. Lipsium l.c. p. 27. Aug., *de civ. Dei.*, xviii. 54. *De Trinit.* iv. 5, 9.

tine tried to explain this allegorically.[13] Elsewhere, however, he confesses his "ignorance of the consulship in "which our Lord was born, and that in which he suf-"fered;" and this ignorance, he says, "has led some into "the supposition that he was forty-six years of age when "he suffered." At the same time he thinks that his real age can be gathered from S. John's statement that he was about thirty years of age when he began public life. Eusebius, on the other hand, favours the year 785 (or 786), and appeals to Phlegon who, in his account of the Olympiads, mentions an eclipse of the sun as occurring on April 3rd, in the fourth year of the 202nd Olympiad. Origen, too, appeals to the same authority, and calculates that forty-two years intervened between the fifteenth year of Tiberius and the destruction of Jerusalem,[14] and elsewhere he allows the same interval between the death of Christ and the destruction of the city. Epiphanius and the Greeks side with Chrysostom,[15] who represents the public ministry as lasting two years and a quarter, and Jesus as dying in his thirty-third year; i.e. in the third year after the consulate of the Gemini, and consequently on March 21st, 785. "For, as the Gospel tells us, and we have often remarked, "the Pasch was anticipated. It should have been eaten "on the fifth day of the week, whereas it was eaten two "days before the legal time, that is, on the evening of the "third day of the week."

The Resurrection sets a seal on the whole life of Christ. Without the Resurrection his life would be as meaningless as religious life without immortality, or the hope of a future reward. Of what avail would have been the example set by Christ in humility, self-denial, charity, patience and obedience unto death, had the Holy One been allowed to see corruption? His example would lack force and life; it could not inspire courage and hope, unless, in addition to strength in suffering, it had shewn forth victory

13 *De Doctr. Christ.* II. 42.
14 *In Math.*, Serm. c. 40. *C. Cels.* iv. 21.
15 *Haer.*

in temptation, triumph in persecution, and life in death. "If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, "and your faith is also vain."* For our hopes rest, not on a weak and mortal foundation, but on a foundation that is strong, spiritual, heavenly and divine. How could we hope for life everlasting in Christ, unless he had already united the human with the divine in everlasting glory? Wherefore the Apostles were the especially appointed witnesses of the Resurrection;[16] on this truth, firstly and chiefly, they built the Christian faith in the Son of God, the judge of the living and the dead;[17] upon Christ, whom the Father raised from the dead, and seated at His right hand, they grounded their hope in the conversion of Israel and of the whole world.[18]

The Resurrection had been foretold by the prophets, and Christ himself[19] had repeatedly foretold it as a sign to the unbelieving Jews.† "And again another Scripture "saith: They shall look on him whom they have pierced."‡ On the third day the Crucified arose in glory from the sealed tomb. "And behold there was a great earthquake. "For an angel of the Lord descended from heaven; and "coming, rolled back the stone and sat upon it. And his "countenance was as lightning, and his raiment as snow. "And for fear of him the guards were struck with terror, "and became as dead men."§ And "behold some of the "guards came into the city, and told the chief priests all "the things that had been done. And they being assem-"bled together with the ancients, taking counsel, gave a "great sum of money to the soldiers, saying: Say you his

16 Acts I. 22; II. 32–36; III. 15; IV. 33.

17 Acts x. 42; xvii. 31. Rom. i. 4; vi. 9; viii. 34; xiv. 9. Col. iii. 1. Apol. I. 18.

18 Apol. III. 18; v. 31; x. 44. Rom. iv. 25; v. 10; vi. 10; x. 9. I. Cor. xv. 17. Gal. II. 19. II. Cor. iv. 14; v. 15, 20. Phil. III., 10, 21. See Steude, *Die Vertheidigung der Auferstehung Christi*, in *Theol. Stud. in Krit.* 1887, p. 203.

19 B. 15 (16) 10. John II. 19. Math. xvi. 21; xvii. 9, 23; xx. 19. Compare the parallel passages.

* I. Cor. xv. 14.

† Matth. xii. 40.

‡ John xix. 37.

§ Matth. xxviii. 2 seq.

"disciples came by night, and stole him away when we "were asleep. And if the governor shall hear of this, we "will persuade him, and secure you. So they taking the "money, did as they were taught; and this word was "spread abroad among them even unto this day."* "What didst thou say, O stupid cunning? Wast thou in-"deed so utterly void of the light of godly wisdom, and "confounded in the bottomless pit of thine own falsehood "as to tell them to say: 'His disciples came by night, and "stole him away whilst we slept?' Part of the testimony "of thine own eye-witnesses was that they were asleep at "the time; thou thyself wast asleep not to be able to see "that on their own testimony, their testimony must have "been worthless."†

But as the greater the miracle, the fiercer the attack, the evidence on which the miracle rests must be more closely examined. The proofs of its reality are partly historical, partly psychological. All the Evangelists and S. Paul record the fact of the resurrection, and various appearances of the risen Saviour. The women visiting the tomb in the early morning saw the first apparition. Magdalene saw the Lord, but Peter and John saw only an empty sepulchre. Cephas was the first Apostle to whom Christ appeared;‡ then he was seen by the twelve, to whom he shewed his wounds, that they might be fully convinced that his body was real and not a phantom.§ After that, he appeared to five hundred disciples at once, many of whom, doubtless, were still living when S. Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians. Then, again, he was seen by James and the Apostles; and unbelieving Thomas had his unbelief dissipated by palpable proof. The appearance to the disciples on the Lake of Genesareth, on which Matthew, Mark and John agree, is the only one mentioned by Matthew, who, in accordance with his scope and plan, represents it

* Matth. xxviii. 11–16.

† S. Aug. on the Psalms (lxiii. 7). Marquess of Bute's Translation of the Breviary.

‡ Luke xxiv. 34.

§ Ibid. 36; John xx. 19 seq.

as the one predicted by our Lord. Luke, on the contrary, confines his notice to the appearances in Jerusalem. He tells us that Jesus led his disciples out as far as Bethany on the Mount of Olives, and that "it came to pass whilst "he blessed them, he departed from them, and was car-"ried up into heaven." But in the Acts, he tells us that Jesus conversed with his disciples for forty days after his resurrection, before he was raised up, and a cloud received him out of their sight. A special apparition was subsequently vouchsafed to persecuting Saul before the gates of Damascus,—an apparition which S. Paul declares to be equal to those granted to the other Apostles.* Both the Acts and the Epistles teach the resurrection of Christ's body in clear set terms, and imply it whenever the question of the resurrection is mooted.[20]

There was, then, no lack of conviction as to the fact in the disciples. Nor is the evidence shaken by apparent discrepancies in the Gospel narratives. Obscurity in minute details cannot overthrow a huge fact. And if the plea be set up that the testimony in the Gospels is not unexceptionable, because their evidence is "theatrical scene-painting," the one Pauline Epistle, which is universally allowed to be genuine, is sufficient to dispel all doubt, and to set the perfect veracity of the Gospels in a clear light. Thus the certainty of this great fact is not impaired by discrepancies in the narratives. And the discrepancies to which we refer are not merely the rolling away of the stone, the number of the angels, the journeyings to and fro of the women—these present but slight difficulty,—but chiefly the appearances. Matthew and Mark seem to be unaware of any appearances outside Galilee, while Luke, John and Paul know of none outside Jerusalem. One Evangelist seems to leave the impression that Christ either ascended into heaven from Galilee or not at all. Mark, it is true, mentions the order Jesus had given to the Apostles to

20 Acts II. 31; xxiv. 15; xxvi. 8, 23. Rom. viii. 10. Phil. iii. 10. II. Cor. iv. 14; v. 1.
* I. Cor. xv. 8–11.

betake themselves to Galilee, where they would see him; but, in the concluding part of his Gospel, the genuineness of which is sometimes questioned, he tells the story not of the Galilean appearance but of others. Luke's narrative reads as if Christ had ascended into heaven on Easter day. Finally, at the end of John's Gospel the appearance in Galilee is amalgamated with those in Jerusalem, and the Ascension is passed over in silence.

In this, as, indeed, in other matters, it is easier to ask than to answer questions. The editors of the *Wolfenbüttler Fragments* long ago detected these "contradictions," as they were pleased to name them, and they poured out torrents of bitter irony, in which they hoped to drown all defence of the Gospels. Many apologists frankly concede that any attempt at perfect reconciliation is quite hopeless.[21] The difficulties in the way are, indeed, great; but they are not insurmountable except for those who hold to the theory of verbal inspiration, and, perhaps, for those also who look upon the Gospels as nothing but "Tradition fixed by writing." Once we grasp the position taken up by the Evangelists, viz., that each wrote with a set literary purpose, the key for opening the difficulty is at hand. Matthew's omission to mention appearances out of Galilee is quite intelligible from the scope and arrangements of his Gospel. The command to repair to Galilee seems, at first blush, to imply that there were to be no appearances in Jerusalem. But, in biblical usage, such phrases are not really exclusive. That this particular command was not, may be gathered from Mark's account, even if we suppose that the conclusion of his Gospel, as we have it, is a somewhat modified version of the original. Luke, it is true, seems to crowd all the appearances into one day; but, since he mentions the command given to the disciples to stay in the city until they were endowed with power from on high, it is clear, that the other events had

21 Steinmayer, Gebhardt, Beyschlag, and others. See Steude, l.c. p. 209.

not escaped his notice. Some of them he records, by way of supplement, in the Acts. The fourth Gospel, again, presupposes the Synoptists. The plan and scope of John's Gospel did not call for any mention of the Ascension. But chapters xiv-xvii abundantly prove that it was known to him. For he here records Christ's promise to send the Paraclete from the Father; he also speaks of Christ's return to the Father, to the glory he had before the foundation of the world.

And now a further difficulty presents itself. Is it not strange, it will be asked, that the disciples failed to recognize Christ when he appeared? Mary saw but knew him not, and mistook his voice for the gardener's. The disciples going to Emmaus thought they were walking and conversing with a stranger. At the Lake of Genesareth none recognised him. Is not this strange? and how shall we explain it? In truth we can not offer a better explanation than that given by S. Luke: "But their eyes were held that they should not know him."* And this explanation is quite sufficient. The risen Saviour had it in his power to appear or not, to make himself known or not, as it pleased him. This effect he might bring about by objective or subjective means. that is, either by appearing in "another "shape,"† or by working on the minds of the Apostles, or, most probably, by combining both methods. Mary recognized her beloved master by the endearing name Miriam, and the disciples in Emmaus by the breaking of bread; the recognition in both cases being effected by a familiar act which brought back to their minds their former life and conversation with him. It is singular, no doubt, that, in the apparition on the lake, the disciple whom Jesus loved, should first recognize him. But is it not also very natural? Would not the fire that glowed in the pure heart of the virgin Apostle, burst into flame, as He who had come to cast fire on earth,‡ drew nigh? We

* Luke xxiv. 16.
† Mark xvi. 12.
‡ Luke xii. 49.

should certainly infer so from the words of the disciples at Emmaus: "Was not our heart burning within us, whilst he spoke in the way and opened to us the Scriptures?"* In other apparitions they recognized him at once. The fact that at one time, they thought they saw a spirit (Luke xxiv. 37), presents no difficulty. On the contrary, it harmonizes with the natural feelings of men† as well as with the disturbed state of mind in which the disciples must have been since the terrible night of the passion. It was so difficult for them, as it would be for every one, to realize that he who had died on the cross, was now living. For this reason he convinced them by every token of reality; he ate and drank with them, though as S. Augustine thinks, he did so after the manner of the angels.

As was remarked long ago, the doubts and suspicions, the coldness, reserve and almost sceptical spirit of the disciples have proved a veritable boon for faith, by enhancing the value of their evidence. The Fathers even make bold to praise Thomas for his unbelief, as if it had rendered more useful service than the belief of the others. The Evangelists lay considerable emphasis on the fact that the disciples were incredulous and dull of understanding. S. Luke thrice gives expression to this thought: "And "they understood none of those things, and this word was "hid from them, and they understood not the things that "were said."‡ S. John also urges it: "For as yet they "knew not the Scripture, that he must rise again from the "dead."§ Again, when the sons of Zebedee asked to sit one on the right hand, and the other on the left in the kingdom of God, their desires were based on the supposition that the Messianic Kingdom would be established without the intervention of death and resurrection. Only by the resurrection and Christ's repeated appearances did they come gradually to learn the truth. The news brought by the women they set down as "idle tales."‖ "O fool-

* Luke xxiv. 32.
† Math. xiv. 26.
‡ Luke xviii. 34.
§ John xx. 9.
‖ Luke xxiv. 11.

ish, and slow of heart to believe in all things which the prophets have spoken,* said our Lord to the two disciples. Even when Jesus shewed them his wounds, "they yet believed not, and wondered for joy."† S. Thomas would not be satisfied without a palpable proof;‡ and when it was vouchsafed to him, he exclaimed: My Lord, and my God.§ And S. Peter says: "Him, God raised up the "third day, and gave him to be manifest, not to all the "people, but to witnesses pre-ordained by God, even to "us, who did eat and drink with him, after he rose again "from the dead."‖

To charge the disciples, therefore, with credulity or superstition is perfectly gratuitous. Nor is there a shred or a shadow of evidence for the assertion that belief in the resurrection grew out of interpretations of the prophecies. The marvel rather is that, in the face of prophecy, the Apostles were so slow to believe. But the truth is that our Lord's passion had depressed their spirits, and the Jewish ideal of the Messias, from which they were but slowly weaning themselves, had warped their judgment. Between Christ's first and second coming, the pre-christian Jewish Schools drew no distinction. They knew of no coming but that in which the good were to be set free, the wicked punished, and the everlasting Messianic reign established.[22] It was the later Rabbinical Schools that first drew the distinction, and represented the Messias, after the accomplishment of his politico-religious mission, as dying and bequeathing his kingdom to his descendants. The earlier view seems to have stamped itself on the Book of Henoch. That it was present to the minds of the disciples, we may most certainly infer from the conversation of the disciples going to Emmaus, and from what the fourth Gospel says about the stay and the return of the

22 Langen, *Judenthum*, p. 415. Welte, *Theol. Quart.* 1842, p. 38. *Commentar zu Lucas*, p. 561.
* Ibid. 24.
† Ibid. 41.
‡ John xx. 25.
§ Ibid. 28.
‖ Acts x. 41.

Messias. Such, too, doubtless, must have been the thoughts and feelings of the disciples as they set out with Christ on the last journey to Jerusalem. Considering, then, the turn events had taken, belief in the resurrection, unless driven home by the most cogent proofs, became immeasurably more difficult, and for this reason Christ furnished such proofs to the disciples. Their belief in the Messias before he died, had prepared them to believe in him when risen. But the Pharisees were not yet ripe for belief in the resurrection. They required still further preparation. "Blessed are they that have not seen and believed."*

But, some one will say, is not this way of presenting the facts in regard to the resurrection and the belief of the disciples, part and parcel of a system of deception? The disciples being the sole witnesses, and feeling that exception might be taken to their testimony, deemed it necessary to place it above suspicion. And what means more suitable for such a purpose than to show in all its force and intensity their own stubborn unbelief? This, they felt, was the only way to gain credence. This, we fully allow, is the reason why the Evangelists never weary of insisting how dull and hard of belief the disciples were. Surely it was a matter of vital importance that their testimony concerning the resurrection should be unimpeachable. How could they otherwise put forward the fact as the chief motive of belief? But that they gave an untruthful report of events, we strenuously deny. The intention and design attributed to them in the objection under consideration is in itself perfectly legitimate, and quite compatible with the truth of their records. What should we have said if the Evangelists had pictured the disciples as eager and ready to believe from the first, and as perfectly instructed in all that concerned the Messias and his Kingdom? What, again, would have been the comments of those who hold, that a consciousness of his messianic calling only gradually dawned and grew upon Jesus, and that

* John xx. 29.

he went up to Jerusalem, resolved to conquer or to die, seeing that his kingdom must be established then or never?[23] This contrast, besides revealing the naturalness of the one narrative and the unnaturalness of the other, shows that the Evangelists were bent upon giving a vivid description of their former dulness and unbelief, in order to erase all doubt as to the truth of the facts, from the minds of all readers, especially of those far removed in time and place from the scene in which the facts were enacted. Hence the third and fourth Gospels and S. Paul go further in this respect than the others.

The foregoing events have brought us by easy steps to our second argument, which is made up of *psychological* considerations founded on the Gospel narrative. It may be stated as follows: Firstly, the behaviour of the disciples both before, during and after the passion, is utterly unintelligible if they fully understood the work of redemption. Secondly, their firm faith, unshaken conviction, and undaunted courage culminating in heroic martyrdom, are altogether meaningless if they were not absolutely certain of the fact of the resurrection. One of the disciples had betrayed his master; the others had run away. The disciple that loved him most, and the bravest one who had drawn his sword in his behalf, were able to summon up just enough courage to follow him from afar. And what was the issue in the case of the latter? He denied his master three times! On the way to Calvary Jesus met some sympathizing women of Jerusalem, but no disciples. At the foot of his cross there stood Mary his mother, but only one disciple. An hour or so after all was over, S. Luke reminds us that "all his acquaintance and the women that had followed him from Galilee, stood afar off beholding these things." The disciples, we are quite aware, were exposed to dangers from which the women were free; still their fears were great above measure. Now we ask, did these same disciples incur less danger and risk

23 Weizsaecker, *Das Apost. Zeitalter*, Freiburg, 1886, pp. 552.

when they went forth to preach that he whom the Jews had crucified, was risen and living? And what do the apostles say? "We ought to obey God rather than men"; and they rejoiced that they were accounted worthy to suffer insult, for the sake of the name of Jesus. How can we explain the changed feelings without the certain fact of the resurrection? Will it be said that the descent of the Holy Ghost would account for the change? How, then, should they believe in the descent of the Holy Ghost, except they knew that Christ had risen from the dead, and had ascended into heaven, and had sent down the Spirit, the Paraclete? S. Peter unites the two as inseparably connected: "This Jesus hath God raised again, whereof all we are witnesses. Being exalted therefore by the right hand of God, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath poured forth this which you see and hear."*

Again, had the fact of the resurrection been uncertain, the Apostles would not have remained together in Jerusalem at all; they would have dispersed and returned each one to his own home and calling. The Synoptists mention the prophecy of Zacharias (xiii. 7) concerning our Lord. "I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be dispersed."† It was, then, most natural for them to return to their homes. Thomas, we are told,‡ was resolved to go and die with him. What course of action would he be likely to take after our Lord's death? What motive could the Apostles have had for assembling in Jerusalem but the certainty that Christ had risen? None whatever. Without it, their faith, their energy, their conduct, either in the present or in the future, their belief in a future resurrection would be the veriest psychological riddle. But if they had had incontrovertible evidence

* Acts II. 32-33.
† Matth. xxvi. 31.
‡ John xi. 16.

that Christ was risen, their reason for going into Galilee and remaining in Jesusalem is clear beyond the reach of doubt. They were carrying out the instructions their master had given them. It was natural that, to prepare themselves for their great mission, they should repair to the district where their master had chiefly exercised his ministry; and it was equally natural that they should return to Jerusalem to be endowed with power from on high to build up the New Israel on the ruins of the old sanctuary. If, on the other hand, we suppose that Jesus was crucified at Jerusalem, against his will, that his career ended ignominiously, and that he never rose again, how could such men, as we know his disciples to have been, have dared to resume Jesus' work in the way they did? This, as Weizsäcker rightly thinks, is the most wonderful and at the same time the most inexplicable event in the whole transaction.[94] "It is impossible that such unbounded faith should have "welled forth from a bottomless ocean of grief." And be it noted, this firm faith, this unflinching courage sprang into being all at once, almost immediately after our Lord's death. No scheming, or deliberation, or reflection was possible. This great result was suddenly effected by a power from without which seized the disciples and carried them onward. Whence came it?

Is there, then, no escape from this inextricable maze of internal and external argumentative threads, asks dispairingly the negative critical school, in whose eyes the resurrection, like everything supernatural, is *a priori* impossible? The old device of the Pharisees was too clumsy and ineffectual. It is too great a tax on our credulity to ask us to believe that the disciples stole the body, and then spread the report that he had risen. So a new theory had to be devised. Christ died not really, but only apparently: he was in a trance. This has been the favourite theory since the days of Schleiermacher, and it has found a recent advocate in Hase. Thus, he thinks, Jesus

94 Weizsaecker, p. 15.

proved himself to be the self-healing physician. Let us, then, for argument's sake, fling overboard the realistic Gospel narrative; let us then suppose that a body thus tortured and mangled had enough physical strength to revive—what a picture of a risen Christ! Strauss imagines, on what ground we cannot say, that a half-dead Christ would have inspired his followers with enthusiasm. And would the enthusiasm awakened by a body half-dead, and on the brink of the grave, have permanently endured? This trance-theory, it must be confessed, is but a poor crutch for a lame theory, which runs its head against the clearest proofs from history and psychology.

The *Vision* theory, perhaps, is psychologically more feasible. Belief in the Messias, it says, was so intensely strong, that, in several, though not necessarily all the Apostles, it issued in visions. Religious enthusiasm, we are assured, passes like an electric current from one body to another. One man, fully convinced, could instil belief into tens, yea, hundreds of thousands. Why, this very fact itself is mentioned in Scripture. S. Paul's belief in a the resurrection certainly took its rise in a vision. But, firstly, would the Jews have looked for this realization of their Messianic ideal in one whom the Jewish Synagogue and people had caused to be crucified? Would not their ideal have forced them to look elsewhere for its realization? Nor, again, was S. Paul's a vision in the sense of our opponents. The Saviour appeared to him in his glorified body. S. Paul invariably contrasts Christ's resurrection with his death, and consequently is speaking of his bodily resurrection. Furthermore, he puts the vision that he saw on exactly the same footing as the apparitions vouchsafed to the older Apostles and disciples.* Of the appearances made to the women he makes no mention, because they lay outside the scope of his epistle, which was to show that his authority was equal to that of the other apostles, whose authority Jewish

* 1 Cor. xv. 1, 7.

emissaries were trying to set up against his own. The supposition that Peter and James had visions and communicated them to the rest, is itself the baseless fabric of a vision.

But S. Paul, it is urged, knew nothing about an empty tomb. Well, even so; will this invalidate the testimony of others who had seen the tomb? But S. Paul says in so many words: Christ died, and was buried, and rose again the third day according to the Scriptures. The certain knowledge he had acquired from other sources is not ruled out of court by an appeal to the Scriptures; far from ousting, it does but confirm the fact which is taken as granted. Could S. Paul have spoken in such clear decisive tones, had he the reality of the resurrection been weighted with uncertainty? So thoroughly is he persuaded of its truth, that he puts his vision on a level with the intercourse which those had had with our Lord who knew him in the flesh.*

The Vision-theory may be a convenient escape-ladder: but on what proof does it rest? Is it just and fair to the books of the New Testament? The behaviour of the disciples on the third day is quite unaccountable by any vision, subjective or objective. For such a vision all objective and subjective conditions were wanting. This theory, as even Weizsäcker acknowledges, leaves much unexplained. The fact remains that S. Paul and the other Apostles *thought and were convinced* that they had seen the Lord; but *how* this came about is, like the first beginnings of all inner religious life, wrapped up in mystery and swathed in some "creative force."[25] Between vision and reality the Apostles were well able to distinguish. Their faith in Christ's second coming would not have stood so firm, unless supported by the resurrection.

Between a real resurrection and deception, there is no alternative. And deception in this case, would be tantamount to fraud. Upon the fact of the resurrection the Apostles built

25 *Ib.* p. 5.
* 1 Cor. ix. 1.

their faith and hope, and that of their disciples. If Christ be not risen, neither shall we rise. For eighteen hundred years this has been the watchword of faith. Without the resurrection Christ's work is unfinished; his life comes to an unnatural ending; and his Church is without foundation or corner-stone. "A dead man counts for naught. . . Only the living can "work and influence men. Let us therefore use our eyes "and judge justly. Day by day Christ is leading innumer-"able souls, both Greek and barbarians, to believe his "teaching and to put it in practice. In the face then of "these moral changes which Christ continues to work how can "there be a doubt that he is risen, yea and is life itself."[26] "Christ, say the critical school,[27] "to have gained the faith of his hearers, must have been possessed of great force of soul; his appearance must have been wonderfully impressive and awe-inspiring; he must have been penetrated with a deep sense of his Messianic calling." This conclusion we may fittingly apply to the Apostles and the Church who preached the doctrine of the resurrection. Christianity cannot be founded on the quicksands of deception, fraud, or error. "For to "imagine that the greatest blessing ever conferred on the "world had its origin in superstition is a flagrant outrage to "common sense."[28]

Lastly, how was the resurrection effected? The question *how*, say the Greeks, is the mother of doubt. But, in this present instance, it need not shake our faith. Mysteries, as we pointed out in Chapter X, lurk in every nook and cranny of nature. Life teems with mysteries. God's omnipotence, wisdom and love are the only basis on which any miracle can be understood.[29] To the unbeliever, the sufferings and death of a God-man seem rife with absurdity, and hence he pronounces Christ's resurrection to be impossible. But to the believer

26 Athanasius apud Möhler, *Athanas.* p. 173.
27 Weizsaecker, *Neue Untersuchungen*, p. 8.
28 Cf. Tertull., *de carne Christi* c. 5. Kuhn, *Einleit.* p. 338.
29 Ambros., Ep. 17, 18. Prudentius, *c. Symmach.* II. M. Müller, *Relig.-Wiss.* p. [illegible]

they are living realities, emanating from God's infinite power, wisdom and love. Nor does Holy Scripture leave us completely in the dark as to the state of a risen body. The Gospels tell that Christ was transfigured ; that he entered a room where the doors were shut ; it tells us that, after the resurrection, we shall be like the angels ; that our bodies will be spiritual, incorruptible, impassible, bright and luminous.* But, because a gross material existence is denied, it does not therefore follow that the risen Christ was a mere bodiless vision, and that his real body lay mouldering in the grave. S. Peter, surely, never dreamed that the transfigured body he saw on the mountain was ethereal and unreal.† For forty days, therefore, Christ appeared to the disciples in his real, though glorified body ; and he was wholly and entirely Christ, as they had known him during the three years of his public life.[30]

30 For the wide literature see the authors quoted above. For the life of Jesus we may name on the Catholic side, Sepp, Schegg, J. Grimm, Camus. On the Protestant side, Hase, Weiss, Beyschlag. See also *Liter Rundschau*, 1883. No. 11 and 12. For the history of the Passion see Friedlieb, Langen, Wichelhaus, Hengstenberg, Nebe.

* I. Cor. xv. 51, 52. II. Cor. v. 1 seq.

† II. Petr. I. 16.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE PERSON AND NATURE OF JESUS.

Hitherto we have been considering merely the human and external element in the life of Jesus. But any sketch would be incomplete which excluded all rays of light from a higher life, and which did not give an occasional glimpse of the divine majesty shining through the veil of humanity. To have realized the ideal man was in itself a divine work, that cannot fail to strike all who survey the life of Jesus from its human side. But Holy Scripture does not leave the divine side of Jesus' character in total eclipse, for the divine nature is therein as clearly visible as the human.

Is not this, some one will ask, a question for dogmatic theology? We think not. For as Christ's divinity is being everywhere assailed on positive grounds, the apologist is bound to look to his defences. So great, too, and widespread is the influence of Christianity, that even unbelievers strive to justify their infidelity on Christian grounds. Many invoke Christ's name to overturn his authority, and, so to speak, to justify themselves before the tribunal of Christianity and their own conscience. So great, in spite of infidelity, is the moral force of Holy Scripture and Christian doctrine, that each one seeks to enlist them on his own side.[1] If, therefore, the apologist

1 See Möhler, *Ges. Schriften*, I. 350. Schmid, *Wissensch. Richtungen*, p. 26. Cf. Aug., Ep. 118.

were to ignore the question, he would be shirking his duty. Hence we have to enquire whether the teaching and belief of the Church in regard to our Lord's divinity has any foundation in revelation.

Did the disciples look upon Jesus before his resurrection as a mere man? Was it only then that they were enabled, by the help of the prophecies, to recognize in him the Messias, and the son of man coming in the clouds of heaven? Every day the opinion seems to be gaining ground that not only are the Synoptists and John at variance on the point, but that the difference between them consists in a positive transformation of doctrine, and not merely in the fact that the explanation given by John and Paul is clearer and more profound. While the human Christ recedes from sight, the heavenly Christ is pushed more and more to the front, and the details of the picture are one by one filled in. But a closer scrutiny shows that it is really not so, and that, from the first, the Synoptists accentuate the divine element in the economy of redemption. Mary has conceived by the Holy Ghost, and is delivered of a son who shall be great, and shall be called the son of the Most High; and the Lord God shall give him the throne of David his father, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. The Holy Ghost will come upon Mary, and the power of the Most High will overshadow her. And therefore also the Holy One, born of her, shall be called the Son of God.* As soon as the Messias entered on his public career, he is described on the banks of the Jordan as the beloved son in whom God was well pleased. Jesus himself declares: "all things are delivered to me by my Father . . . and no one knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom it shall please the Son to reveal him."† Would not such words in the mouth of any man, however gifted, be arrogant? To the high priest's question: "I

* Luke i. 26-338.

† Matth. xi. 27.

"adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us if thou be "Christ the son of God," Jesus answers "Thou hast said it." And he adds: "Nevertheless I say to you, hereafter you shall "see the son of man sitting on the right hand of the power of "God, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high-"priest rent his garments, saying: he hath blasphemed."

The disciples, moreover, had recognized the higher nature of their master: "And they that were in the boat came and "adored him saying: Indeed, thou art the Son of God."* Who is not struck by Peter's confession: "Thou art Christ, the Son "of the living God?"† Jesus rewarded his confession with the words: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, because flesh "and blood have not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is "in heaven." And at the foot of the cross the very heathen centurion declared: "Indeed, this was the Son of God."‡

But are not these testimonies weakened by the other Synoptists, in whom some are either wholly wanting, or are put in a different form?§ And does it not, therefore, follow that their idea of Christ is different from Matthew's? Not in the least. At most it follows that they preferred general and implicit expressions to definite and explicit. And this is sufficiently accounted for by the circle of readers for whom they wrote. Matthew's Gospel was written for Jewish Christians in Palestine, who were as familiar with the Old Testament terminology as with oral tradition. Mark and Luke, on the other hand, wrote for Gentile Christians, less familiar with the Old Testament and the life of Jesus, who, on hearing of the Son of God, would at once be reminded of their own mythologies. S. Paul, ideeed, often speaks of the Son of God, but it is in trusty letters to communities of some standing, which had previously been orally instructed. But in proving the divinity of Jesus to the heathens the Evangelists had

* Ibid. xiv: 33.

† Ibid. xvi. 17.

‡ Ibid. xxvii. 54.

§ Mark vi. 51—viii. 29—Luke ix. 20; xxii. 67

to adopt a method at once more intelligible and less liable to be misunderstood, by, as it were, suggesting it to the reader as a natural inference from the miracles he had worked, and from the sanctity of his life. The first verse of Mark's Gospel does not emerge unscathed from the fire of textual criticism, because in many MSS., the decisive words, "The Son of God," are wanting; still their genuineness is very probable. The words are: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." The Gospel itself develops this theme by vividly setting forth the miracles of Jesus. The miracles recorded by Luke produce the same impression, but work more on the feelings and the heart. He by no means esteems them as of little worth. To say, therefore, that Christ's divinity is not taught by the Synoptists is a charge as unjustifiable as it is old, which has been already disproved by Origen, Athanasius, Cyril, and Augustine.[2] One concession, however, they freely made: viz., that no one has taught the divinity of Jesus so clearly as John. Athanasius explains it by saying that the Apostles, out of regard for the Jews, did not at first preach the divinity of Jesus and the Incarnation. "For the Jews at that time, being themselves in "error, and leading the Gentiles into error, thought Christ "was a mere man of the race of David, like other descen-"dants of David; but they believed not that he was the "very God, and that the Word was made flesh. For this "reason the Apostles, with great prudence and tact, first "directed the attention of the Jews, to the human side of "the Redeemer."[3] But, surely, they must have been equally if not more considerate for the heathens.

But the Synoptists themselves are said to furnish positive evidence to the contrary. The human actions of Jesus recorded therein prompted Celsus to deny his divinity. One who is born, who hungers and thirsts, who suffers and dies, who, on the eve of his death, trembles and is betrayed by his disciples cannot,

2 Cf. Orig., *in Nath.* xii. 6. Cyrill. Alex. c. Jul. 10 (ix. 327 Migne). Möhler, *Athanasius*, p. 100.

3 De Sent. Dion., p. 433. Cf. Petav., *de Incarnat.*, I. 2, 1.

in his eyes, be God. But do these actions prove that Jesus was a mere man? that he passed, or wished to pass with the disciples for a mere man? He, indeed, calls himself the Son of man. But so far from proving his purely human personality, this phrase points very decidedly to something beyond. The very fact, too, that it was also well known to S. John,[4] should whisper caution. The epithet describes rather the man of heaven than of earth. It is the connecting link between the Christology of the Synoptists and that of John.[5] For, be the explanation what it may, each and every explanation must be built upon the vision of Daniel,[*] to which Jesus himself appeals before the high priest. Here the epithet took its rise; and here it designates a Son of Man, who having previously existed in heaven, had now came down from heaven to earth.

But still greater difficulty attaches to that word of our Lord, in which he speaks of the sin against the Holy Ghost. "Therefore "I say to you: Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven men, "but the blasphemy of the Spirit shall not be forgiven. And "whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall "be forgiven him; but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, "it shall not be forgiven him."[†] Can the writer of the first Gospel, who penned this remark, have supposed that Christ was divine in any sense?[6] This difficulty has already been answered by the Fathers, in connection with the previous expression: The Son of Man.[7] In these words, they say, Jesus, is speaking of himself, under the poor and lowly aspect in which he stood before the Jews. He who takes offence at the lowly form, which conceals the Son of God, is excused, if not justified in opposing him, and speaking against him. For this reason Jesus promised to pardon his enemies, even those who had crucified him, and

4 John i. 52; iii. 13; vi. 27, 53, 62; viii. 28; 23, 54; xiii. 31. See also v. 27.
5 See Franke, *Studien u. Krit.*, 1887. p. 323.
6 Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeit.* p. 110.
7 Schanz, *Comment. in Math.* p. 328.
* vii. 13.
† Matth. xii. 1 .

he did not exact absolute and perfect faith till after his resurrection. But it was otherwise with the Holy Ghost, the representative of the Godhead, who had actively revealed himself in the works of Jesus. He who denied the works, or referred them to Beelzebub, deliberately and maliciously shuts his eyes to God's revelation. Jesus indeed worked by the Spirit of God; but it does not follow that this Spirit of God was not likewise his own spirit. The point in dispute centred in the question: by what power are devils cast out? by the power of God or of the devil? The relation in which the Spirit stood to Jesus was not in dispute. Clearly, then, the divinity of Jesus is not hereby denied, although, perchance, the Fathers may not have been warranted in seeing in this passage a positive argument for his divinity. From it we can only conclude that there were two sides to Jesus' person; one, poor and lowly, for the eye of flesh, the other exalted and majestic to the eye of the spirit. It is in his former capacity, that words spoken against the Son of Man will be pardoned. Although an antithesis, it likewise forms a parallel. For a mere man would not have dared to put an offence against himself in antithesis to the sin against the Holy Ghost.

Nor, again, do the genealogies in the first and third Gospels tell against our position. Human genealogies for the Son of Man, and Messianic genealogies for the Messias are links in the chain of the proof from prophecy. But, if Jesus was not really the son of Joseph, do not these proofs lose all force? One might be tempted to fall in with the conjecture, hazarded by some commentators, that S. Luke's Gospel gives the genealogies of Mary; but it is improbable, not because female genealogies are non-existent,* but because the text does not afford the slightest ground for the conjecture. But of what use, then, is a male genealogical table which fails at the critical moment? It seems to us that the writers of the Gospels would have omitted the genealogical tables altogether, had they im-

* See Judith viii. 1.

agined that they would tell against our Lord's divinity. Is this, perchance, crediting them with more shrewdness than is their due? Nevertheless, their insertion cannot have appeared so utterly useless to the evangelists as it does to some modern critics. Neither the Baptist, nor Jesus, nor the Apostles attached much importance to the human descent; nor did they imagine that a miraculous interposition at the end of the line interfered with the Messianic descent. When we see the way in which the evangelists have traced out the whole genealogy of the Messias, and particularly when we bear in mind the women mentioned in S. Matthew's Gospel, we cannot but admire the wonderful Providence of God. Of course the authors were convinced that Jesus was descended in the flesh from David;* but this descent is safeguarded if Mary was of the house of David. And this, surely, should be taken for granted, since it was customary to wed women of the same tribe. S. Luke gives strength to this conjecture, for he regards Mary's descent from David as self-evident.† The words "of the house of David,"‡ which he adds, must refer to Mary, as Joseph's descent from David is expressly noted elsewhere.§

He calls Mary Joseph's "espoused wife" on the very journey to Bethlehem. What other meaning then may the expressions "Parents," "Father and Mother," have in this case? What was more natural than this title, which was already sufficiently secured against misunderstanding, and which was recommended alike by its brevity, and by the Jewish manner of speaking of spouses? But when Joseph is expressly called the putative or supposed father of Jesus, all doubt is removed. To the Jews this relationship was certainly unknown. They regarded a duly solemnized marriage as a real marriage. Thus the previous history is not contradicted by the words which Matthew

* I. 32-69.
† II. 24.
‡ III., 2, 3.
§ Matth. xiii. 55.

puts in the mouths of the people, "Is not this the carpen-"ter's son? Is not his mother called Mary, and his breth-"ren James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Jude? And his "sisters, are they not all with us?"* Mark, who has recorded nothing of the Infancy, gives the words more accurately, thus: "Is not this the carpenter, the Son of Mary," etc.? Possibly his greater accuracy may have been prompted by the desire to prevent all misunderstanding; but, even in the other Gospels, all who care to do so, can easily steer clear of misunderstandings. With equal reason or unreason the same conclusion might also be drawn from John VI. 2 and from VII. 41; it might be argued that Jesus was not born in Bethlehem. Yet, surely, S. John's Gospel teaches clearly and unmistakably Christ's divinity, and sufficiently indicates how unreliable was Jewish testimony regarding his origin.†

Philip, too, says to Nathanael: "we have found him of "whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, "Jesus the son of Joseph of Nazareth."‡ And in spite of his doubt, whether any good could come out of Nazareth, Nathanael greets Jesus with the words: "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.§ It is not difficult to set these two statements in formal contradiction with each other, and then to trace them to various fragmentary sources; but it is far harder to explain how the evangelists, who have manifested an unusual shrewdness in their compositions, could have been simple enough to leave these traces of foreign ideas if they had really been so dangerous to their theory. If everything ran smoothly and evenly, and exactly fitted the idea, we should have ground for more serious complaints. But, by setting forth clearly the views of these contemporaries of Jesus, the sacred writers show that their sources of information were the best, and that they were quite sure of their facts.

* vi. 3.
† See vii. 27.
‡ John i. 45.
§ Ibid. v. 49.

Let any one but examine the beautiful picture the evangelists have painted with such force and simplicity of the life and character of Jesus; and let him then set it side by side with the dwarfed ideas and airy remarks of critics, and nothing will induce him to part with the *beau ideal* of human life.

What the evangelists had hinted at rather than declared is taught definitely and with exceptional clearness by the Apostle Paul. To Cyril's astonishment, Julian, in the passage quoted above, ranked Paul as low as the Synoptists. Cyril thought the charge abundantly refuted by Romans ix. 5, and other passages besides.[9] And yet, all this notwithstanding, the charge, though in a somewhat modified form, has often been re-echoed in modern times. In the genuine epistles, in the four "great Pauline Epistles," S. Paul, it is said, teaches nothing about the divinity of Jesus,[8] i.e. of the Son of God who existed before the Incarnation. Pre-existence becomes thus the hinge on which all turns; for it is conceded that Christ is called the Son of God, and that he is enthroned at the Father's right hand. But the very objection implies that the other Pauline epistles teach the pre-existence more or less clearly, and consequently the divinity of Christ. And indeed Colossians i. 15–17, for instance, cannot be explained in any other way. The epistle to the Philippians also, to which critics have been more than usually merciful, teaches it clearly. True, the passage in ii. 7–10 is a crux to commentators, because the subject is treated in such a way, that one cannot be quite sure where the Logos ends and the God-man begins; for one might feel tempted to attribute to the Apostle the idea that Christ had a human nature in heaven, before the world was made. But, apart from these difficulties of exegesis, the fundamental idea of pre-existence is untouched. The text, the antithesis between the form of God and the form

8 See Volkmar, *Jesus Naz. und die christliche Zeit mit den beiden ersten Erzählern.* Zürich, 1882.

9 Romans viii. 8; xv. 15; I. Cor. ii. 8.

of a servant, the humilitation and obedience even to the death of the cross, the name that is raised above all names, and so forth, speak for themselves. In the Epistle to the Colossians the Word's connection with creation comes to the front. "The "Father hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and "hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love, "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the re-"mission of sins: Who is the image of the invisible God, the "first-born of every creature. For in him were all things "created in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether "thrones, or dominations, or principalities, or powers. All "things were created by him and in him and he is before all, "and by him all things consist."* Anything further would only spoil the picture. This has clearly the ring of the book of Wisdom. There is a parallel passage, in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

But what about the great Pauline Epistles? I hear the reader impatiently ask. I might ask, in turn, what if S. Paul wrote the smaller Epistles too? Or is it on account of such passages as these that their genuineness has been questioned? Still we have no wish to shirk the burden of proof. The great Pauline Epistles are so saturated with belief in the perfect divinity of Jesus, that without it they are absolutely incomprehensible. How, otherwise, could the sacrifice on the cross form the central point of Paul's doctrine of redemption and justification? How could grace and salvation be found in Jesus alone? Salvation is from God. The Apostle begins his most magnificent Epistle with the words "Paul, a servant of "Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the "Gospel of God, which he had promised before by his "prophets in the Holy Scriptures, concerning his son who was "made to him of the seed of David according to the flesh, "who was predestinated the Son of God in power according "to the spirit of santification, by the resurrection of our Lord

* Coloss. I. 13-17.

"Jesus Christ from the dead." A comparison with the passage in the Philippians will shew the unity of the leading idea in both. The son who came in the flesh must have existed before he took flesh; the Son of God, who by his resurrection was translated to his own position, is the same who appeared in the flesh; the humiliation of the divine nature is seen in the Incarnation, and the elevation of the human nature in the resurrection and ascension. "God sent his Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and hath "condemned sin in the flesh."* How else can Romans iii. 31, 32, be explained: "If God be for us, who is against "us? He that spared not even his own Son, but delivered "him up for us all, how hath he not also, with him, given "us all things?" Chapter ix. 15 is also formally incontestable: "Of whom (the Father) is Christ according to "the flesh, who is over all things, God blessed forever, "Amen." On critical grounds this passage is disputed, and an effort has been made to change its meaning by changing the punctuation. Tischendorf puts a full stop after the first part, and the second part is explained to be one of the ordinary Pauline doxologies. On the other hand Westcott and Hort contend that this division is impossible, and substitute a comma. No one can credit the Apostle with such a leap from Christ to the Father, without the Father having been named before. The second part of the phrase requires absolutely the same subject as the first. As regards textual criticism the course is clear. The oldest Greek MSS. have no stop; one only (C, cantabrigiensis) has a full stop. This is the construction put upon it by Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Novatian, and in the Epistle addressed by the people of Antioch to Paul of Samosata; and in Post-nicene times there are but two exceptions. From the first the passage has been so construed. And the thought is entirely in harmony with the context, and the fundamental idea of the letter. In the 10th chapter Jesus is extolled as the salvation of all men,

* Rom. viii. 3.

who is rich to all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved."[9]

In the Epistle to the Corinthians the divinity of Jesus is also unmistakably taught. From passages in which it is said that God reconciled the world to himself in Christ (II. Cor. v. 19) one might perhaps object that Christ's divine character is there ignored. But the reply is to hand. Firstly, in that case, the reconciliatory worth of the sacrifice would hardly be intelligible, and secondly we have positive passages which* say that by Christ the universe exists: "God the Father, of whom are all things, ". . . and Jesus Christ, by whom are all things," and when† the rock that gave water in the desert is referred to Christ, the Apostle makes us suppose that this Christ, for whom he now preaches the word of reconciliation, was the Creator of the world, and the leader of the people of Israel, and that he existed as the Logos from all eternity. Only on this supposition could he describe it as a universal practice among Christians to call on his name, i.e. to pray to him.‡ In the Epistle to the Philippians he says that all things in heaven, on earth and under the earth should bow the knee at the name of Jesus; and this is done only to God.§ As Jahve is the Lord in the Old Testament, so, in S. Paul's Epistle, Jesus receives this name:‖ the Lord who became poor for our sakes, when he was rich, that we might grow rich through his poverty.** The conclusion of the second Epistle is a doxology: "The grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the "charity of God, and the communication of the Holy "Ghost be with you all;" but it shows how usual was this combination, and how universally Christians were filled with the belief that grace comes from Jesus, who is of a like

9 Rom. x. 12. Compare i. 16; ii. 9; iii. 29; xi. 32, 36. Tischendorf, Ed. viii. a. 1. Westcott and Hort *a.l.*

* I. Cor. viii. 6.

† I. Cor. x. 4.

‡ I. Cor. i. 2.

§ Romans xiv. 11.

‖ I. Cor. ii. 8; viii. 6.

** II. Cor. viii. 9.

divine nature with the Father and Holy Ghost. We mention the Synoptic parallel* merely in passing. From the Epistle to the Galatians, we need only recall the fourth chapter which contrasts, the Old Law with the New, the son with the slave. "When the fulness of time came, God sent his Son, "made of a woman, made under the law; that we might receive "the adoption of sons."†

It is, perhaps, possible that Paul's fundamental conception of the heavenly Christ may have been suggested by the appearance of the glorified Christ before Damascus; or, again, that he may have been influenced by the widespread Jewish idea of the heavenly world, in which the Messias and the glories of the Messianic kingdom exist, and are only waiting to be unfolded.[10] But, on the one hand, it is indisputable that in the Old Testament, and prominently in the LXX.,[11] allusion is made to the premundane generation of the Logos; and, on the other hand, it is enough to institute a comparison with Philo to see that the difference is as great as the distance of heaven from earth. Not the preparation for the Messias and Redeemer, nor the Logos-Messiās, but the translation of the Logos from one condition to another, *i.e.*, the Incarnation is the essential mark of distinction. The Incarnation is not the initial state, but the period of transition between pre-existence in the form of God and the assumption of glorified human nature into heaven. By the resurrection Christ became a heavenly being. But this Christ, whom alone, and nought else besides,[12] Paul, cared to know (unless I. Cor. v. 17 be otherwise explained, and a distinction be drawn between the Jewish and Christian idea of a Messias), is in no way a mere exalted man, but the Son of God, the Lord, a heavenly, *i.e.*, a divine being. In his eyes the

10 Weizsäcker, p. 550. Harnack, p. 886. Franke, p. 333. II Cor. iv. 18. I Cor. vii. 31. See I John ii. 17. Math. xxv. 34. (Henoch; iv. Esdras?) John vii. 27.

11 B. 109 (110), 3. Langen, *Judenthum*, p. 396.

12 Weizsäcker, p. 123, 125. Against, Aberle, *Einleitung*, p. 152.

* Matth. xxviii. 19.

† Galat. iv. 4; vi. 18.

risen Saviour is, indeed, a man from a higher, supernatural world;* but he is also more than this. The Apostle's doctrine of Christ's pre-exi tence is not built up from popular belief, nor deduced from Christ's personal appearance, but it is the entire groundwork of his faith and of his proof. And in no place is there a shadow of a contradiction! "At a time when "the primitive Apostolic tradition about Jesus was represented "by a number of eye-witnesses, the Apostle Paul taught that "Jesus was the restorer of humanity, who had come down from "heaven, and the Son of God, whom the Father used as his "organ in creation and redemption. There is absolutely no "evidence that this teaching brought him into collision with "Apostolic communities, or that it sounded strange in their "ears."[13] External and independent testimony of the same truth is also furnished from the 1st Epistle of S. Peter.[14] We are therefore bound to assume that the early Church so believed, and that Jesus himself so taught. The person and works of Christ were, from the beginning, the centre of gravity of faith.

We need not, therefore, be surprised that the doctrine concerning the personality of Jesus is developed in the Gospel of S. John. As the doctrines of Jesus are the foundation on which S. Paul has raised that conception of Christ which he first expressed in his great Epistles, and then further expounded in the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Hebrews (though in these last Christ figures more as the Saviour); so, in the fourth Gospel, the preaching of Jesus is the soil on which has grown the fully developed doctrine of Jesus' personality as the centre of Christian faith. And yet John has given us more of the historical Christ than Paul who dwells by preference on the glorified Christ! Far from losing himself in ideal speculations about the Logos, he gives the reader a vivid

13 Weizsäcker, *Neue Untersuchungen*, p. 222. Franke, p. 328.
14 I Petr. i. 11, 20, 23; II. 1 seq. Cf. II. Petr. iii. 18.
* I. Cor. xv. 45-49.

picture of the actual life of the Messias. The belief in Christ, the Son of God, is the main purpose of his Gospel. If John unreservedly teaches the divinity of Jesus, he is drawing the doctrine from his own faith, from the store of his own reminiscences. The fact of his teaching no one seriously disputes, as abundant proofs are furnished by the prologue and conclusion. Still, the passages in which Jesus alludes to his pre-existence call for special notice.

"Amen, amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, "I am."* "And now glorify thou me, O Father, with "thyself, with the glory which I had before the world was, "with thee."† "Father, I will that where I am, they also "whom thou hast given me may be with me: that they "may see my glory, which thou hast given me, because "thou hast loved me before the creation of the world."‡[15] Lately an attempt has been made to weaken or destroy the force of these passages, by making them merely a part of the narrative of the Evangelists. But no external grounds give a colour to this proceeding. On the contrary, they are intimately bound up with the whole theme and treatment of the Gospel. The connection between the Christological and theological questions could easily be shown. In the discourse, especially the farewell discourse, the idea of what is common to Father and Son on the one hand, and to the Holy Ghost on the other, is clearly brought out. "I and the Father are one."§ Nor can we set against this Jesus' frequent appeals to His Father which, as S. Chrysostom correctly explains, were made out of regard for Jewish prejudice. In order to lead them by degrees from rigid monotheism to the belief of several persons in God, Jesus began with the Father whom all admitted, and then put forward his claim as the Messias sent by the Father. Any one who closely follows the train

15 See I. John ii. 28; III. 1; v. 20. Schanz, *Commentar zu Joh.*, p. 37.

* John viii. 58.

† Ibid. xvii. 5.

‡ Ibid. xvii. 24.

§ Ibid. x. 30.

of thought in the studied expressions of S. John will find that the starting-point in his narrative and argument is Christ the Messias, and that the course of the narrative leads up to Christ's consubstantiality with the Father. Many passages of the Apocalypse would furnish further proof.*

There is one passage in S. John's Gospel which may with some semblance of right be urged against the foregoing. "For the Father is greater than I."† This and a few passages in the Synoptists and in the Epistles[16] left their mark on Ante-nicene Theology. They were twisted by the Arians in favour of their Subordinationism, and are now used by Protestant commentators for the same purpose. The Ante-nicene Fathers were wont to refer them to Christ as Son of God, i.e. to the eternal relation that subsists between Father and Son, between the source of the Godhead and its product, between the whole Godhead and a part, between the eternal truth and the eternal Word. They meant to say that the Son is inferior to the Father, not in nature, but on account of his origin from the Father. But since the Arian controversy, these passages have been very generally explained of the twofold nature of Christ. Christ as man was truly inferior to the Father, who is God and represents the whole Godhead. There may be at times special reasons for urging this point. Again considering the scope of the revelation by the Logos, or the divine economy, Christ as man may be represented as not knowing some particular thing the Father knows.

If the Lord is said to be always in need, this "harmo-"nizes with his poverty, that we may be made rich in him, "not in order that we may dishonour the Son of God. "For this reason the Son of God became man, that the "sons of men, Adam's sons, might become sons of God. "For he who was born in an ineffable and eternal way of "the Father in heaven, was born in the time of Mary, the

16 Mark x. 18; xiii. 32. Acts II. 35. Rom. I. 3. Hebr. I. 4; III. 2.

* See Apoc. v. 15.

† John xiv. 28.

"Mother of God, that those who before were born of "earth, should now be born of heaven i.e. of God. So "having a Father in heaven, he received a mother on "earth. And he calls himself the son of man, that men "may call God their Father. Just as we, who were the "servants of God, have now become his children, so the "Lord of servants became the son of the servant, Adam's "son, that the mortal sons of Adam might become the "sons of God."

In these beautiful words S. Athanasius sums up his masterly exposition of what may be called the subordination passages, and shows the reason and purpose of this wonderful union of divine majesty with man's lowly nature; of God's wisdom with man's nescience. This way of expression was chosen for the sake of man and for the sake of the revelation vouchsafed to man.

CHAPTER XVIII.

CHRIST'S DOCTRINE AND WORK.

"What sign, therefore, dost thou shew that we may see, and "may believe thee? What dost thou work? Our fathers did "eat manna in the desert, as it is written: He gave them "bread from heaven to eat." * To this question asked by the Jews, after they had crossed over to Capharnaum from the other side of the lake, where Jesus had miraculously fed them, Jesus answers, by pointing to a better gift—to the bread of faith—faith in the Son of God, who had come down from heaven—and to the bread of life in the Holy Eucharist. He that eateth Christ's flesh and drinketh Christ's blood shall live for ever. This doctrine is from heaven, and is its own ratification. "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any "man will do the will of him, he shall know of the doctrine "whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself."[1] † And this doctrine the Father confirms by works. When the Jews took up stones to stone him, because that being a man he made himself God, Jesus answered them: "Is it not written in your "law: I said you are gods? If he called them gods, to whom "the word of God was spoken, and the Scripture cannot be "be broken: Do you say of him whom the Father hath sancti- "fied and sent into the world: Thou blasphemest, because "I said, I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of

1 See also Matthew xiii. 14; xvii. 11; xxvi. 31. Luke xxii. 37. John iii. 14; v. 39, 45; vi. 32, 45; vii. 38; xiii. 18.

* John vi. 30.

† vii. 16.

"my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though you will "not believe me, believe the works, that you may know "and believe that the Father is in me, and I in the "Father."* "But I have a greater testimony than that "of John. For the works which the Father hath given "me to perfect, the works themselves, which I do, give "testimony of me that the Father hath sent me."† The Jews, indeed, were not converted. They sought all the more to lay hands on him and to stone him.‡ To believe in the divinity of Jesus, to believe that his nature was equal to that of the Father, seemed to the Jews rank blasphemy. This was their great stumbling-block. Now Jesus did the works of the Father to shew that he was not a mere envoy, but truly the Son of God, and God. And his miracles, which we have heretofore invoked as a test of revelation, should be viewed under this special aspect.

In the Old Testament the Father had foretold all, and to it Jesus appeals. For the Prophecies, too, must be looked at from the same point of view. To the prophecies fulfilled in his person Jesus often alludes. Concerning the passage from Isaias, which he read aloud in the Synagogue, he says distinctly: "This day is fulfilled this Scripture in your ears."§ When he bade the disciples of John look to his miracles,‖ the reference to Isaias is so clear, that there can be no doubt that he intended to point to a prophecy that had been fulfilled. When he spoke of the stone rejected by the builders becoming the head of the corner, he is reminding the Pharisees of Psalm CXVII. (CXVIII.) v. 22: "By the "Lord this hath been done, and it is wonderful in our eyes." He interprets Psalm CIX. (CX.), 1 of the higher and divine nature of the Messias: "The Lord said to my Lord, sit on my "right hand, until I make my enemies thy footstool."**

* John x. 34-38.

† Ibid. v. 36.

‡ Ibid. x. 39.

§ Luke iv. 21.

‖ Matth. xxi. 42.

** Matth. xxii. 44.

To the murmuring disciples going to Emmaus he says in general terms: "O foolish and slow of heart to believe in all things "which the Prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have "suffered these things, and so enter into his glory? And "beginning at Moses and all the prophets he expounded to "them in all the Scriptures the things that were concerning "him."* And to the Eleven the risen Saviour said: "These "are the words I spoke to you while I was yet with you, that "all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the "law of Moses, in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning "me. Then he opened their understandings that they might "understand the Scriptures. And he said to them: Thus it is "written and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise "again from the dead the third day; and that penance and "remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all "nations, beginning at Jerusalem."†

So the Apostles and Evangelists, in seeking to explain all the important events in the life of Jesus according to the Scripture,‡ were following the example set by their master, and acting on the instructions they had received. A considerable part of the preaching of the Apostles, whether it began with the life of Jesus § or with the law and the prophets,‖ was taken up with proof from prophecy, Nor does an occasional misquotation of the prophecies detract from the dominant idea in the four Gospels. Some, perhaps, are in minor details open to criticism, but prophecies quoted by the Apostles and Evangelists are, on the whole, indissolubly linked with the person of the Messias, the Son of God. The Scriptures must be fulfilled.** And this very necessity which is, in some sense, the highest freedom, serves to prove the personality of Jesus.

* Luke xxiv. 25-27.
† Ibid. 44-47.
‡ I. Peter i. 20.
§ Acts x. 34.
‖ Acts ii. 14; xiii. 12 seq.
** Matth. xxvi. 54.

But is not the subjection of Jesus to necessity unworthy of him? It would be if it arose from aught but the Father's will, or if the Spirit that spoke in the Old Testament were not the Spirit of God and also of Christ. Of him also the saying of our Lord is true: The truth shall make you free. Christ became minister of the circumcision for the truth of God to confirm the promises made to the fathers.* Thus there is a wonderful cohesion between the two Testaments, and all revelation culminates in him who was to come. And does not this shew that this one was greater than John and the prophets?

But if we wish to pursue the subject more in detail, and trace revelation step by step in its progress, we must make the Protevangelium our starting point. God, indeed, promised fallen man that from the seed of the woman should come a Redeemer who would crush the serpent's head,† but he left it undetermined whether the seed was to be understood in a personal or in a collective sense. One thing, however, was clearly expressed, namely, that this seed was to blot out sin and destroy the power of the devil. But, when Jahve chose to Himself a people, this general prophecy, which merely predicted the restoration of the primitive state,‡ assumed a more definite shape. For his chosen people the expected redeemer will surely come; with his people he will sit in judgment on the Gentiles, and rule over them. And the Jewish Kingdom is given him for an inheritance. He will be of the seed of Abraham,[2] and of the race of Juda. He is styled a king, and of David's royal house.[3] "The Lord hath "sworn truth to David and he will not make it void, of the

2 Genes. xii. 3; xviii. 18; xxii. 18. Compare also with xxvi. 4; xxviii. 14. See Himpel, *Die Messian. Prophetien im Pentateuch*, in Theol. Quart. 1859, p. 60.

3 II. Kings xxvii. 11 seq; iii. 5. Ps. 89, 30.

* Rom. xv. 8.

† Gen. iii. 15.

‡ The reader will bear in mind that the author is looking at these prophecies from the point of view of the Old Testament not of the New. Tr.

"fruit of thy womb I will set up on thy throne."* But this king of David's royal house will not merely restore the splendour of the king, and subjugate the people;[4] he will also diffuse the peace of God over the earth, and assure victory and prosperity to the good. He is the King, the Christ, or the Messias, (anointed) as the promised one was called from the time of Samuel onwards.[5] And whereas by the seed of the woman and of Abraham might have been meant merely a highly gifted man, from this time forwards the divine side of the Messias came more and more to the front.

The Messias is at once the Son of God and the Son of David. By David, the only prophet-king,† the great mystery is first foretold. The Messias is begotten of God from eternity;‡ he sits as Lord at the Father's right hand,§ and is priest according to the order of Melchisedech. He is the Word of God that helps and heals.[6]‖ "There shall come forth a rod out of the "root of Jesse, and a flower shall rise up out of his root. And "the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him: the spirit of "wisdom and of understanding, the spirit of counsel, and of "fortitude, the spirit of knowledge and godliness; and he shall "be filled with the spirit of the fear of the Lord. . . . In "that day the root of Jesse, who standeth for an ensign of "peoples, him the Gentiles shall beseech, and his sepulchre "shall be glorious."** "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, "and I will raise up to David a just branch; and a king shall "reign and be wise; and shall execute judgment and justice in "the earth. In those days shall Juda be saved, and Israel shall

4 Ps. 2, 1 seq; 45, 4; 119, 1 seq.

5 I. Kings ii. 10. See Kaulen, p. 182. Oswald, *Erlösung*. I. 22.

6 Friedlieb, *Leben Jesu*, p. 66. Compare Ps. 25, 19 (John xv. 25); 31, 6 (Luke xxiii. 46); 41, 10 (John xiii. 18 and Acts I. 16); 49, 5; 78, 2 (Math. xiii. 35).

* Ps. cxxxi. 11.

† II. Kings xxiii. 2.

‡ Ps. ii.

§ Ps. cix.

‖ Ps. xviii. 20.

** Isaias xi. 1-4. 10.

"dwell confidently; and this is the name that they shall call "him: The Lord, our just one."* "And I will set one shepherd "over them, who shall feed them, my servant David: he shall "feed them and be their shepherd."† "And I will have mercy "on the house of Juda, and I will save them by the Lord their "God."‡ "And thou, Bethlehem Ephrata, art a little one "among the thousands of Juda: out of thee shall he come forth "unto me that is to be the ruler in Israel."§

The supernatural character of the Messias is here clearly indicated; but it is set forth still more prominently in those prophecies which depict the spiritual character of the new Messianic kingdom, in imagery borrowed from the golden age of the kings. The divine nature of the Messias shines forth more and more resplendently.[7] He will found a new kingdom, will conclude a new covenant with his people,[8] and give a new law.‖ And thus, like Moses, he will show himself to be a prophet sent by God.** The people that walked in darkness, have seen a great light, and to them that dwelt in the region of the shadow of death, light is risen.†† "For a child is born to us "and a Son is given to us, and the government is upon his "shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, "God the Mighty, Father of the world to come, the Prince of "Peace. His Empire shall be multiplied and there shall be no "end of peace. He shall sit upon the throne of David, and "upon his kingdom, to establish it, and strengthen it with "judgment, and with justice, from henceforth and for ever."‡‡ Then shall the wolf dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall

7 Friedlieb, p. 70.

8 Ps. 72 and 110. Mich. v. i. Dan. II. 30. Mal. I. 10. Jerem. xxxi. 31. Ezech. xi. 19.

* Jeremias xxiii. 5. 6; xx. 8. 9; xxxiii. 15.

† Ez. xxxiv. 23; xxxvii. 24.

‡ Osee i. 7.

§ Mich v. 2.

‖ Ezech. xxxvi. 26.

** Deut. xviii. 15.

†† Is. ix. 2.

‡‡ Isaias xi. 6.

lie down with the kid, &c.* He is a new corner-stone in the foundation of Sion,† a servant of God, an elect of God, in whom God delighteth;‡ the saviour of justice;§ the light of the Gentiles; and he will bear salvation to the farthest parts of the earth.|| "And I will move all nations; and the desired of "all nations shall come; and I will fill his house with glory, "saith the Lord of hosts."** "Sing praise and rejoice, O "Daughter of Sion; for behold I come and will dwell in the "midst of thee."[9] Jahve is here speaking of his own coming. Now as a reference to other prophecies will show, by the coming of Jahve we must understand the coming of the Messias; for Jahve comes with him whom he sent; the Messias is Jahve's salvation. "I beheld therefore in the vision of the night, and "lo, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, "and he came even to the Ancient of days; and they presented "him before him. And he gave him power, and glory, and a "kingdom: and all peoples, tribes and tongues shall serve him. "His power is an everlasting power that shall not be taken "away, and his kingdom shall not be destroyed."†† In the truly mysterious seventy weeks of years‡‡ Daniel indicates the very time of his coming.

After the Captivity, when Simon I, the Hasmonean, was invested with the sovereign power, it was stipulated that he should hold it "for ever, till there should arise a faithful prophet."§§ Although the royal and worldly character of the Messias asserted itself from time to time in Jewish tradition,[10]

9 Zach. ii. 10; iii. 8; ix. 9. Cf. Os. ii. 10. Joel iii. 1 seq.

10 Fritz, *Aus antiker Weltanschauung*, p. 378.

* Ibid. xi. 6. seq.

† Ibid. xxviii. 16;

‡ Ibid. xlii. 1:

§ xlv. 8.

|| xlix. 6; lxii. 11. seq.

** Aggeus ii. 8.

†† Daniel vii. 13. 14.

‡‡ Ibid. ix. 24. 26

§§ I. Machab. xiv. 41. This passage, by the way, gives a clue to the meaning of the phrase "for ever" (*in æternum*), by the sacred writers.

still the prophecies regarding his higher nature were not overshadowed, nor could the rabbinical teachers evade their force, except by a strained and artificial generalization of all the minutiæ. To what lengths the rabbis were prepared to go in this matter is shown by the fact that they regarded themselves as prophets, and the givers of a new law, and declared their teaching to be as important as that of Holy Scripture. "If there are, indeed, two perfect men on earth," says R. Simeon ben Jochai, "they are my son and I." And R. Nachman bar Jacob was wont to say: "If the Messias is now living, I am he." "The Talmudist rabbis credited themselves with the power of working miracles and forgiving sins. They even called themselves sons of God.

We have already mentioned the prophecies which foretell that the Messias will humble himself, suffer, and die. These give the finishing stroke to those which picture him as the king's son, and the ruler; fo ar Messias, who suffers and dies, can rule nowhere but in the spiritual sphere, and even there, only if he come from heaven. The abasement began with his birth. Isaias described him as a child, with empire on his shoulder. To king Achaz he promised a sign in Jahve's name. "The "Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold a virgin shall "conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called "Emmanuel. He shall eat butter and honey, that he may know "to refuse evil, and to chose the good.[11]" Any explanation of this passage, that excludes the Messias, is philologically and historically inadmissible. The Hebrew word (*almah*) does not mean a young woman. The notion of marriage is quite foreign to the word. And how could a young woman, conceiving and bringing forth, be construed into an extraordinary sign? The Messianic interpretation, it is true, robs the sign of its "tangible character," but to faithful Israelites, it was nevertheless a sign, because the expectation of the Messias was a pledge of their present security. That the Jews, who lived just before

11 See Welte, in *Theol. Quart.* 1842. p. 31.

Christ, were not unfamiliar with the prophecy that the Messias was to be born of a virgin, we may gather even from the Erythræan Sibyl, and Vergil's eclogue. Nor was this interpretation of the prophecy called in question before the Jews began to have controversies with Christians.[12] It could not refer to a child of Achaz or of the prophet himself; nor does the context warrant this view. If it be contended that the prophet was speaking of ideal persons, we answer that these find their consummation in the Messianic child. Micheas foretold his birth in Bethlehem. The passion and death are strikingly depicted in the second part of Isaias.* Zacharias describes the entry into Jerusalem. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Sion; "shout for joy, O daughter of Jerusalem. Behold thy "king will come to thee, the just and saviour: he is poor, "and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an "ass."† The same prophet, too, foretells the betrayal for thirty pieces of silver.‡ The types need only be enumerated. In the New Testament the following types are specially mentioned—*Persons:* Noe, Melchisedech, Agar, and Sara, Moses, Josue, David, Solomon; *Things:* the Paschal lamb, manna, the water from the rock, the brazen serpent, Sion and Jerusalem, the tabernacle and the temple, the priesthood and the sacrifices.

These prophecies, it has been said, do not refer to a definite person nor to a definite spiritual kingdom, and hence they cannot have been fulfilled in Jesus. In later times, it is true, the Messias became more and more identified with the chosen people and the theocracy, and the people of Israel became the types of the servant of God; but in the earlier Jewish prophets, and even in Jeremias and Ezechiel, the personality of the Messias is unmistakable. Nor had the latter-day Jews

12 Justin., Dial. 71. Langen, *Judenthum*, p. 402. Schanz, *Commentar. zu Matthaeus*, p. 88.

* Isaias lii. 53. lxii. 11. Cf. Ps. xxii.

† Zachar. ix. 9.

‡ Ibid. xi.

banished the idea of a personal Messias; it was only in the sceptical allegorizing Judaism of Alexandria that the idea of the Messias became enveloped in mist and obscurity.[13] Josephus, who was very clever at evading the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, relates of his contemporaries: "But now, what "did most elevate them in undertaking this war, was an "ambiguous oracle that was also found in their sacred "writings, how about that time one of their country should "become governor of the habitable earth." And this prediction, thinks the servile friend of the Romans, the Jews took "to belong to themselves in particular; and many of the wise "men were thereby deceived in their determination. Now, this "oracle certainly denoted the government of Vespasian, who "was appointed Emperor of Judæa." In truth, a pretty bantering for the Jews, from a Jewish mouth! a striking confirmation of Our Lord's words, that the Jews knew not how to read the signs of the time! They rejected their Messias, for they would have no king but Cæsar.* Still so strong was their belief in the Messias, that they were convinced, that some one must come and deliver them from the Romans. "However," continues Josephus, "it is not possible "for men to avoid fate, although they see it before-hand. But "these men interpreted some of these signals according to their "own pleasure, and some of them they utterly despised, until "their madness was demonstrated, both by the taking of their "city, and their own destruction."[14]

Philo spiritualized the idea of the Messias, and thereby bears witness to the general belief of his day. The Sibylline prophecy, which implies Isaiah VII. 14, and holds out the prospect of the temple being rebuilt and restored in its former splendour, is more Jewish in the beliefs to which it gives utterance; anyhow the view it embodies is far loftier than the gross conceptions of

13 Langen, *l.c.* p. 391.
14 *De Bello Jud.* vi. 5, 4. Whiston's translation. See 8, 9.
* John xix. 15.

the Jews in Palestine. The Samaritans also, as we learn from the fourth Gospel, hoped for a Messias.* In the Targumims Scheloh† is expected to come as Meschicha and king of the house of David; but the passages concerning the suffering Messias are applied to the people of Israel. And when the Messias comes he will judge the Gentiles and liberate the Jews.[15] In the time of Christ there was "scarcely any opinion so general among the "Jews, as that the coming of the Messias was very near "at hand." According to the Gemara of Babylon, nothing has happened for 2000 years: for 2000 years were covered by the Thora, and 2000 are allotted to the Messias. Of this latter period, however, a part is already gone by on account of the sins of the people. It is time for the Messias to come; but his coming will depend on the "re-"pentance and good works" of the Israelites.

The hopes of the Jews in regard to the Messias had come to the ears of the heathen. Tacitus[16] writes on the Jewish war in the same strain as Josephus: "Many are convinced "that the East will prevail, and that some one will come "forth from Judæa and seize the empire." This alludes, he says, to Vespasian and Titus. On the same subject Suetonius observes: "Throughout the East the ancient "opinion had spread far and wide that the fates had de-"creed that some one was to go forth from Judæa and "take possession of the empire." The scene of Vergil's fourth Eclogue, which tells of a son to be born to the Consul Pollio is, indeed, laid at Rome; but, after the manner of the prophet Isaias, it tells of the dawn of a new golden age. The virgin comes back, the kingdom of Saturn returns, a new race is brought down from heaven. The new-born child, with whom the iron age ceases and the golden age begins for the whole world, is under the protection of the gods.

15 Langen, p. 402, 419, 428. Note 1. Friedlieb, p. 76.

16 *Hist.* v. 13. Suet., *Vespas.* c. 4. Sibyll. III. 784.

* John iv. 25, 29, 32.

† Genes. xlix. 10.

This Eclogue is also a proof that the Erythræan Sibyl lived before Christ. Her prophecy sings the praises of the virgin, "in whom God dwells, and to whom he gives immortal light."

The Gospels are, therefore, correct in representing the Jews as being, at that time, on the tiptoe of expectation as regards the Messias. The hopes they cherished are in evidence, although they rejected him when he came. How mightily this expectation agitated their minds may be seen by their repeated demands for a sign, by the popular gossip about "the prophet," and by the question put to the Baptist, whether or no he was the Messias.[17] Opinion, as the fourth Gospel most truly says, was divided, and people were most eager to know what were to be the distinguishing marks of the Messias. And the fidelity with which the fourth Gospel records events is clearly shewn by its frequent and emphatic use of the title of King.[18] The writer of the Apocalypse, though retaining the language of Jewish Apocalypses which pictured the coming of the Messias as close at hand, has in mind Christ's second coming (Parousia), when he speaks of the "new time," and of the things that must "soon" happen. And the discourses of SS. Peter, Stephen, and Paul are unintelligible unless the general expectations of the Jews were then at their height, and unless the "fulness of time" had really come.

The foregoing remarks will enable us to understand why the coming of Jesus Christ was so long delayed, and why he came at this particular time. These questions, which have sorely perplexed Fathers and theologians, are likely to prove a difficulty to all who attentively consider the economy of redemption. Why did God allow several thousand years to roll by, before putting into execution the plan of redemption which He had decreed from all eternity? Why did he suffer

17 Luke ii. 38; iii. 15. Math. xi. 3. Mark xv. 43. John I. 19.

18 John i. 49; vi. 14; xviii. 34, 39; xix. 19. See Schanz, *Commentar zu Johannes*, p. 35.

millions of men to rush headlong into perdition? These and such-like questions suggested themselves to the Fathers, or were put by the heathen.[19] Holy Scripture merely speaks of the time that God had fixed upon as the "fulness of time."[20] The Jews considered it a mystery unfathomable by man;[21] like the time at which the world is to come to an end, it was known to God alone. S. Peter says: "Of which salvation the "prophets have enquired and diligently searched, who prophe-"sied of the grace to come in you, searching what or what "manner of time the Spirit of Christ in them did signify: when "it foretold those sufferings that are in Christ, and the glories that should follow."* As no prophecy can be known in its fulness before it is accomplished, the prophecy of prophecies, and the centre of all prophecy, had first to be fulfilled before it could be seen why God had borne so long with sinners, and why he chose that special time for redemption.† God willed to shew His wrath, and to make His power known that He might shew greater mercy, and make vessels of wrath into vessels of mercy.‡ But for this, time was needed. And God shaped the course of events, as He willed, and according to that law of His wise Providence which proceeds by slow degrees to subdue contrary influences, and to overcome obstacles in a divinely methodical manner.[22] To this question the Fathers have returned various answers. Those among the Apologists, like Justin, Clement of Alexandria and others, who looked at the brighter side of heathenism, held that the Logos was busy at work among all nations long before the Incarnation.[23] In this way the heathen could become Christians before

19 Epist. ad Diogn. I. 8 seq. Porphyrius ap. Aug. Ep. 102. Q. 2, 8. Drey, *Apolog.* II. 234.
20 Tob. xiv. 4 seq. Mark I. 15. Gal. iv. 4.
21 IV. Esdras vi. 10; xiii. 51.
22 Weizsäcker, p. 149.
23 Denzinger, II. 40. Schwane, I. 422. Petav., *de incarn.* II. 17, 9.
* I. Pet. i. 10. 11.
† Rom. iii. 25.
‡ Ibid. ix. 22. 23.

the time of Christ, and thus their justification was not impossible. But, in this theory there was a danger of undervaluing the grace and revelation of Christianity. Hence others said that if Christ had come sooner, fewer would have been redeemed, than now when the world is filled with people.[24] It was, however, the common opinion either that men were barbarous and unworthy,[25] or that, just as physicians wait till the malady is at its height, evil was to do its worst before its cure was to be attempted.[26] The world, they say, needed this negative preparation; and to it others add a positive element, saying that the greater length of time served to intensify the consciousness of sin and the desire of redemption (Augustine). Others, again, give yet another reason: the preparation of a worthy Mother of God.[27] God delivered men to their own desires, not as approving unrighteousness, but to bring about the present time of righteousness; so that being convicted of unjust works they might be justified by the goodness of God, and that, seeing their own helplessness to gain heaven, they might be made fit by the power of God.[28] God's plan of salvation had to take into account the capacity of individuals and the development of the human race. From the beginning, S. Irenæus thinks, God might have made known to man the whole truth; but, man, being as yet in his childhood, could not have grasped it. God, says Leo the Great, had prepared the ancient world, that there might be no room for doubt. "To all men God had, from the beginning, given the "same pledge of salvation." Development is the fundamental law of the universe, both in religious history and the material world. Plants, animals, and men have grown from invisible germs, and the world was gradually formed out of

24 Orig., *in Rom.* iii. 8.

25 Euseb., Aug. (Ep. 102). Cf. Petav. l.c. II. 17. 3.

26 Cyrill. Alex., c. Anthrop. c. 24. Greg., Nyss. ap. Petav. Drey. II. sqq.

27 Euseb., Basil. ap. Petav. See Oswald, l.c. I. 307.

28 Ep. ad Diogn. c. 9.

primeval chaos. In the same way the human race had then reached the stage in which it was ripe for knowledge, and was thirsting for things divine and eternal. And thus all the objections which the heathens made against Christianity, even after its triumph, of being an innovation and a phenomenon without justification in history, are felled to the ground.[29]

To the question why Christ did not come before innumerable multitudes of men had perished, S. Jerome thinks[30] that no answer can be given, because it would forestall divine predestination, that is, the eternal decree of God. The divine plan of redemption is as inscrutable as any other action of God, for man can never follow the workings of God's will in any given case in all its windings. He may discern reasons here and natural courses there which led up to the effect; but the last and ultimate reason will always be the will of God. Hence Augustine always fell back upon predestination as the ultimate reason "What answer, I ask, could they make, if, leaving "out of view that depth of the wisdom and knowledge of God "within which it may be that some other divine purpose lies "much more deeply hidden, and without prejudging the other "reasons possibly existing, which are fit subjects for patient "study by the wise, we confine ourselves, for the sake of "brevity in this discussion, to the statement of this one position, "that it pleased Christ to appoint the time in which he would "appear, and the persons among whom his doctrine was to be "proclaimed, according to his knowledge of the times and "places in which men would believe in him.[31] Augustine expressed this view still more decisively in his latter works, and thereby gave great scandal to the monks at Marseilles.[32] In his treatise on predestination he somewhat toned down this passage. He allows that God, even before Christ's coming,

29 Ambros., Ep. 17, 18. Prudentius, *c. Symmach* II. M. Müller, *Relig.-Wiss.* p. 205.

30 *Ad Ctesiph.* 133.

31 *Ep.* 102 Q. 2, 14.

32 Hilar., *Ep.* 226, 3 (among the Epistles of S. Augustine). Aug., *de praedest.* c. 9; *de dono persev.* c. 9.

gave to all, whether Jews or Gentiles, if they were worthy, the means of salvation. On the other, he says, he did not deem it necessary, in that connection, to discuss whether God merely foreknew, or also predestinated them ; or, according to Ephes. i. 4, he would have referred God's foreknowledge to those who had been chosen in Him before the foundation of the world. He did not think man's endeavours to solve the problem altogether useless. One of his later disciples, however, bluntly gave out that the wit of man will never discover why God, who, from all eternity, has been unchangeable, all-holy, all-knowing, and all-powerful, should have concluded all in unbelief, that He might have mercy on all,[*] and yet that countless sinners should have been left in darkness.[33]

Mediæval theologians followed in the footsteps of the Fathers. Christ, they say, deferred his coming so long in order that man might learn his intellectual and moral helplessness, that the manifestation of grace might be more striking, and that faith might be of gradual growth. To the question whether it would not have been more fitting for God to have become man from the first, S. Thomas answers :[34] As medicine is given only to the sick, it was not fitting that God should have become man from the first beginning of the human race, before it had sinned. Nor, again, was it fitting that he should have become man immediately after the fall, but in the fulness of time, so that man, humbled by sin, might feel the need of a redeemer. And with the Gloss he thus continues : "God "first left man in the law of nature to his own free-"will, that he might come to know his natural powers. "But when he fell away, he received the law. Then "the malady became more pronounced, through the "fault not of the law but of nature. Now this was "done that man knowing his infirmity, might seek grace "and cry aloud for a physician. Secondly it was right

33 *De vocat. gentium*, I. 21 ; II. 1. 30.

34 S. Thom., III. Q. I. a. 5. Cf. Bonav., *Brevil.* P. 4, cap. 4 (ed. a Vicctia, p. 263). Möhler, *Symbolik*, p. 79.

* Rom. xi. 32.

"that due order should be observed in proceeding from things "imperfect to things perfect. Wherefore the Apostle says: "'That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is "'natural; afterwards that which is spiritual. The first man "' was of the earth, earthly; the second man from heaven, "'heavenly.' And yet a third reason lies in the dignity of the "Word made flesh. For, as the Gloss says on Galat. iv. 4. . . . "'The greater the judge that was coming, the longer the train "'of heralds (prophets) that preceded him.'"

Modern apologists generally adopt this view. The Thomists cling with tenacity to the principles of Augustine. "Search "not, or you will surely go astray,"[35] may be said to be their motto. But since, as we have seen, Judaism and heathenism were a preparation of Christianity, we may, without encroaching on the divine mystery, assign several natural reasons, the first and foremost of which is that based on the divine economy. In ancient times, as we have said, revelation followed the law of education; in other words, divine revelation kept pace, as it were, with the education of the human race, till man was ripe for the highest of all revelations. The spirit of man had first to attain the degree of development necessary for understanding the ideas and the commands contained in the Christian revelation. In these days Christian missionaries, before preaching the Gospel to the heathen, find it necessary to ground them in general notions of religion. What is necessary now was then equally necessary for all men. For good or for evil, natural development had to attain its full growth, so that man might see, negatively and positively, that all his efforts to work out his own salvation were unavailing. The void within his soul, the struggle between the good that he wills and the evil that he wills not but does, were to awaken in him a greater longing for redemption. Had not revelation interposed, Aryan and Semite would never have been blent in one; but each required a period

35 See Schneider, in *Philos. Jahrbuch* 1886, p. 269.

of preparation.[36] The negative preparation is, indeed, more pronounced than the positive; but this last may not be wholly ignored without misinterpreting S. Paul. For he allows that the Gentiles can know God and the things of the law from reason and nature; and he calls the law (the Mosaic law, and consequently the natural law as knowable by the Gentiles), a tutor (*paedagogus*) for Christ. But there is yet another reason on which apologists insist, and which must not be lost sight of; namely, that the sacrifice of the cross had a retrospective force. Christ died for all men of all times. The just of the Old Law lived in hope of the Messias. Nor was heathenism void of all grace. God, it is said, never refuses grace to those who do their best. And, in this connection, the saying is most appropriate. None were lost except through their own fault.

At that time the Messias was generally expected, and he appeared just at the right moment. Is not this double fact itself a strong argument in favour of the person of Christ? But a double objection might also be urged. The circumstances of the time were favourable for one who wished to play the part of Messias. Did Jesus, perchance, turn these circumstances to good account? Or was it the circumstances that first made him conscious of his Messianic calling? The first question, which involves a charge that none but a fanatical infidel would make against Jesus, is easily answered. The portrait of Jesus, as painted in Scripture and history, is too noble and too lofty to be blurred with such a stain. Of intentional fraud there can be no question. But was not Jesus himself deceived and carried away by the force of circumstances? At first sight this theory seems not to impute bad motives to Jesus; but it is only seemingly so. For, in the first place, the Gospel represents Jesus as fully conscious of his Messianic calling from the very beginning of his public career. Then, again, had not Jesus been fully conscious that he was the

36 M Müller, *Wissen. der Sprache*, II. 394.

Messias, the interpretation put on the prophecies appealed to in his behalf would be strained and most artificial. Jesus would cease to be the sincere and truthful Messias that the Gospels and Epistles uniformly picture him. The prophecies and the words of Jesus are a spiritual unit that cannot be halved. Had not Jesus been firmly persuaded from the first that Moses and the prophets had prophesied concerning him, he could never have appealed with such unbounded confidence and assurance to the Old Testament, to Moses, and the Prophets. The character of Jesus would have been defective, had he failed to recognize this connection, and this very recognition proves that he was in very deed the Messias.

But for the universal expectation of the Messias that was then rife, the Apostles would have been wholly in the dark about that Kingdom of God, which Jesus declared to be near at hand. Besides "the impression produced by his person and his "power of speech, there was the might of his spirit to evoke "faith."[37] Still men could not have believed Jesus to be the Messias, if they had not believed in a Messias generally, and found their ideal realized in Jesus. They must have seen that the prophecies were fulfilled in him. The Scripture proof was necessary both for the Apostles themselves and for those of their hearers who had not seen the Lord; and in all the plant of faith grew up gradually. Till the resurrection their insight into the Scriptures was incomplete. In the resurrection they found the key that unlocked the Old Testament, and henceforward their proofs were copiously drawn from this source. From this vantage-ground it was at once easy and natural to seek in the law and the prophets for an allusion to the several events in Jesus' life, and thus gradually to cast a "network of proofs over his whole history," and even, from the words of the prophets, to draw his portrait in outline.* And if, at times, the words were said to be merely applied, they would not spoil the

37 Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 28, 34, 123.
* Matth. xii. 18; xiii. 14.

picture; for it would first have to be proved beyond dispute that the "whole narrative is nothing but a tissue of proofs from "the Old Testament, as in S. Matthew's history of the passion.' But S. Paul speaks of Scripture as a person "that has foreseen "all things, and, like Providence, shaped by its words the "course of events," and he thus clearly vindicates its teleological character. This, then, being the standpoint of the Apostles, their immediate faith became a concious conviction and a clear understanding; while to their hearers and to unborn generations the fulfilment of prophecies was converted into a clenching argument for the truth of Christianity. To contend that the person of Christ and the events in his life were of set purpose shaped according to the prophecies is the height of unreason. For "there is not in the Old Testament any one personality, "whose history and typical significance perfectly pourtrays "the individual life of Christ. The Old Testament merely "gives, so to speak, broken rays, or sketches a feature now and "again, that is a type of Jesus, or bears some analogy to the "events in his life. Hence Strauss never succeeded in finding "a Gospel narrative that could be set down as an imitation of "an Old Testament narrative. All he could do was to collect "scraps from different histories, and hold them up as the "*rationale* of the Gospels. Moreover he travelled beyond the "Old Testament, and sought in the folklore of different peoples "for a confirmation of the alleged reasons, which he clearly saw "were feeble and insufficient."[38]

If, then, Christ be the Messias, other consequences will readily follow. His divine sonship is included in the name, Messias;* To it Peter† and John‡ add immediately the words: "The Son of the living God;" "the Son of God." Is this truth contained in the prophecies themselves? or was it

38 Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, I. 154.
* John I. 42; iv. 25.
† Matth. xvi. 18.
‡ Ibid. xx. 32.

imported by the disciples? Does the phrase mean that Christ was really and truly the Son of God, or that he was such only in a moral sense? This point is of paramount importance in the prophecies. For if Christ was really God, prophecy must have been cognizant thereof; if he was not, his title of Messias is divested of all significance for us. If the prophecies represent the Messias as a person, they cannot utterly ignore the divinity of his person. Our Lord himself, as remarked above, put the Jews to shame with Ps. cix. (cx.) 1: "The Lord said to my Lord &c." The Jews did not deny that it applied to the Messias. Is not the Lord of David older than David? "The "Lord hath said to me: Thou art my Son; this day have I "begotten thee."* Though this verse is explained of the eternal priesthood,† and of the resurrection from the dead;‡ it finds its complete explanation in the eternal generation,§[39] which both presuppose. For with Jahve there is an eternal to-day. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. . . . "Thou has loved justice, and hated iniquity; therefore God, "thy God, hath anointed thee."‖ Origen tells how he perplexed some Jews with this text. For whether the anointing refers, as most Fathers suppose, to the Incarnation or, as others think, to the baptism,[40] the epithet "God," in juxta-position with Jahve, proves that the psalmist's notion of the Messias far transcended the common idea in vogue. In Isaias, the Messias is called Immanuel i.e. God with us;** the mighty God, Father of the world to come.†† True, the same prophet‡‡ speaks of the Spirit that is to rest on the Messias, and he mentions by name

39 Wilke, *Hermeneutik*, p. 41.
40 *C. cels.*, I. 56. Cf. Petav., l.c. xi. 8; ix. 9.
* Ps. ii. 7.
† Hebrews v. 5.
‡ Acts xiii. 33.
§ Hebrews i. 5.
‖ Ps. xliv. (xlv.) 7-8.
** vii. 14.
†† ix. 6.
‡‡ xi. 2.

the spirit of piety and fear of the Lord ; but does it follow therefrom that he was ignorant of the Messias' divinity? Not unless he thought the lowly and human Messias incompatible with the Son of God. But this is not the case. On the contrary (leaving Deutero-Isaias aside) he places the "God with us" and the birth from a virgin side and by side. Clearly, therefore, he viewed him as God and man. Jeremias* calls the Messias the salvation of the Lord i.e. he who, like Jahve, is the source of our salvation. Micheas† declares him to be the king whose going forth is from the beginning, from the days of eternity. By calling Jahve the Messias' God, he no more denies his divinity than Zacharias effaces his personality by representing God himself as the deliverer and ruler of his people.‡ Are the prophets to be censured for employing a poetical style to blend the earthly and the heavenly, the royal image with the divine? to identify Jahve at times with his anointed, and again to make one dependent on the other? How weighty these prophetic testimonies were felt to be in later times is shewn by the way in which the Septuagint weakens the force of Isaias ix. 6, by calling the Messias the Angel of Good Counsel instead of God. Jonathan, the Paraphrast goes even greater lengths. Thus he writes: "God shall "call the name of him who is wonderful in counsel: Hero, "appointed from eternity."[41] In like manner he twists the passage from Micheas v. 2 relating to the going forth of the Messias from eternity, "into his name is from eternity." In the passage quoted from Daniel, the divinity of the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven shines forth so resplendently, that the most exacting critic is constrained to allow that a belief in the Messias' existence with God before the world (whatever be the origin of such belief) is here clearly set forth. The Book of Wisdom which expatiates on the metaphysical relations between Jahve and

41 Langen, p. 426.
* xxiii. 6.
† v. 2.
‡ Zach. ix. 8–10.

the Messias brings home the same conclusion.[42] And the Epistle to the Hebrews and the prologue to the fourth Gospel unmistakably apply the same doctrine of the Logos.

The Jews could not wholly shut their eyes to these arguments from the Old Testament. In the book of Henoch, which was composed in the time of the Machabees and which breathes the genuine religious spirit,[43] the Messias is called the chosen one, Christ, Son of Man; but in one place he also bears the name of "Son of God," who is united forever with the Father and with all the just. This chosen one unites indeed with the angels, in praising God, but he also sits on the throne of God's majesty, and is adored by all, and he will rule over all, as he existed before all. "Here we can see how the Alexandrian doctrine of the Logos, and Palestinian doctrine of the book of Wisdom are blended into one Messianic idea—a fusion very rarely attempted in Palestine in the times before Christ." Solomon's Book of Psalms, written about the beginning of the Roman dominion, while dwelling on the worldly side of the Messias office, has also given beautiful expression to the spiritual longing for a Messias-king in a kingdom of truth and justice. In the *Assumption of Moses*, written after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Messias' kingdom is not of this world, and the Messias, besides being Jahve's envoy, is also the Most High, God, the Eternal. To the Messias it applies those Old Testament prophecies which speak of Jahve coming to save his chosen people. On the other hand, the Fourth Book of Esdras draws a clear distinction between Jahve and the Messias, whom it represents as dying after a reign of four hundred years, and it makes no allusion to the resurrection. The view of the Targumists are not so far advanced as those put forward in the *Henoch* and the *Assumption of Moses*. The position they took up was dictated by circumstances. They

42 Prov. viii. 22 seq. Ecclus. xxiv. 5. Wisdom vii. 25 seq.

43 Langen, p. 413, 448, 451, 458.

denied the Messias' preexistence, and toned down his characteristic as in deference to popular opinion! These views, so various, and at times so fanciful, never rise to the idea of a God-man; but they reveal a desire to exalt the Messias above ordinary men, and in a measure, to do justice to his noble character. Even in Christian times, the rabbis could not help testifying indirectly to his twofold character. For lest they should be compelled to acknowledge Jesus to be the Messias, they split up the one promised Messias into two persons: The son of Joseph, aud the son of David. The former is lowly and mean, and succumbs at last to Armillus, Gog, or Magog. The latter, the heir of splendid promise, conquers his foes, and establishes the Jewish empire.[44]

From the Gospels, too, it is clear that people expected the Messias to be the Son of God, as well as a Jewish ruler. The hopes expressed by Zachary and Elizabeth, by Simeon and Anna, are pregnant with spiritual meaning, and represent the ideas of those who were earnestly looking forward to the redemption of Israel. Zachary's Canticle of praise, and Simeon's prayer of thanksgiving show what elevated ideas they had of the salvation that God was preparing for the world. The epithet "Son of God"* is used, either simply or conditionally, even by the demons. On this S. Luke remarks: "And "rebuking them he (Jesus) suffered them not to speak, for they "knew that he was Christ."† Nathanael greets Jesus at the first meeting with the words: "King of Israel" and "Son God."‡ The high priest asks Jesus whether he is the Son of God.§ Neither would have been possible if the Jews had not regarded the Messias as, in some sense, the Son of God.[45] And as they describe Jesus' assumption of the title as blasphemy,

44 Welte, in *Theol. Quart.* 1842, p. 26.
45 Langen, p. 433.
* Matth. iv. 3. 6; Mk. iii. 11,
† iv. 41.
‡ John ii 50:
§ Matth. xxvi. 63.

they certainly understood it in its strict sense. As Jesus, according to prophecy,* was entering Jerusalem on the foal of an ass, the people, on their way to the temple, followed and shouted hosannas to the Son of David. Here, surely, is something that towers above the common wordly ideas that the Jews entertained of their Messias! Here is a religious, a liturgical, a supernatural element, which the miracles of Jesus, and in particular the raising of Lazarus, had aroused in the breasts of the sensual Jews.

With S. Augustine then we may say: "The prophets "preached Christ; but the Godhead of Christ asserted in the "prophets and in the Gospel itself is not perceived even by "heretics; and how much less by Jews, so long as the veil is "upon their hearts."[46] But the wretched condition to which the Jews have been reduced for so many centuries clearly shews that the Messianic prophecies bore a meaning other than they imagined. Bereft of hope and prophecy, and wandering about without a king, they are a living testimony to the downfall of the ancient theocracy, and to their erroneous ideas about the Messias. The sceptre has passed from Juda, the sanctuary is razed to the ground, and the promised land is a prey to the infidel. Jewish hopes, without a spiritual gloss, were vain and foolish. Later rabbis, in trying to harmonize the Law with existing circumstances, not only explain it away, but distort its meaning. Let them not say that the impossibility to carry out the Law has forced them to take this course. When the same impossibility existed during the Babylonian captivity, it stimulated and quickened their hopes in the Messias. Why has it not the same effect now? The answer shall be given in the words of Welte[47]: "The fact that the Law could be carried "out, and was consequently binding, constituted an irrefragable "proof that the Messias had not yet come. Since, therefore, it

46 II Cor. iii. 15. *In Joan.* Tr. 48, 9.
47 Welte, p. 55.
* Zach. ix. 9; Matth. xxi. 5.

"can no longer be enforced, it is clear that it has ceased "to hold good, and that the pre-Messianic age is past." The arbitrary changes the rabbis have made in the text prove diametrically the opposite of what they wish. Their efforts to shew that the Messias has not appeared in the past tell strongly in favour of the view that he has already come. They prove, too, that the Messias promised by the prophets was truly God, and that the sensual worldly hopes built on him rested on the shifting sands. The Jews recognized their Messias neither in his greatness, when he proclaimed himself to be eternal and divine, for their earthly self-seeking ideas could not soar up to an eternal being; nor, again, in his lowliness, when he stood before them, seemingly forsaken by God, as the suffering son of man, because they imagined that the Messias would never die, but would rule his earthly kingdom in majesty till the end.[48] What remained then of the Law and the Prophets?

What a lurid contrast between the glowing descriptions of the everlasting Sion and the matchless sanctuary at Jerusalem, given by the prophets and the Psalmist, and our Lord's prophecy that the temple would be destroyed! The prophets saw in vision all the peoples of the earth journeying to Jerusalem, and falling down in adoration before the sanctuary of the Most High. On the Mount of Olives and in sight of the magnificent temple, Jesus announces to his astonished disciples its impending destruction: "There shall not be left here a stone upon a "stone that shall not be destroyed."* How can these prophecies be reconciled, except by supposing that there were two sides to ancient prophecy? Nor, again, should it be forgotten that the fate of the city and temple was sealed by Jewish guiltiness. How different might have been the progress of the Messianic kingdom, if all the Jews had faithfully rallied round Jesus, or if Jesus had not been forced to complain: "How often would I have gathered "my children about me, as the hen gathereth her children

48 Pascal, x. 7.
* Matth. xxiv. 2.

"under her wing, and thou wouldst not!" Jewish unbelief shaped events differently. But the prophets had foretold both the cause and the effect. By foretelling therefore, the destruction of the temple made with hands, and by laying stress on the spiritual character of the temple which the prophets had foretold, Jesus proved himself to be the greatest of all the prophets. Hence the nearer the time of fulfilment, the more luminous and emphatic are the references of the Synoptists to this prophecy. The resurrection, which had shewn the disciples that all the prophecies concerning Jesus had been fulfilled, and had made them believe firmly that he was the Son of God, would also strengthen their conviction that his prophecy regarding the end was true. After the manner of the prophets, our Lord joins together in his prophecy things that are far and near; he blends things of earth with things of heaven, and he shews that a religious and moral purpose underlies all prophecy. The terrible fulfilment of one-half of the prophecy, besides guaranteeing the fulfilment of the other half, would exercise a religious influence for all time.

Not only in word and in prophecy, but in power and in miracles was the Spirit of God made manifest. Had not Jesus worked miracles he would not have been the Messias. The prophets who had sketched in outline the Messias' life and person, had also foretold that he would shew forth divine power. By themselves, it is true, miracles would not prove him to be the Son of God; but taken in conjunction with our Lord's declaration that he worked miracles in confirmation of his divinity, they became a perfectly valid proof.[49] Miracles alone would merely prove him to be the Messias, from whom, as their greatest prophet, the Jews expected signs as great and even greater than those worked by Moses and the prophets. For this reason divers false prophets (e.g. Theudas the Egyptian) promised to work miracles and to deliver the people.[50] Again,

49 Brischar, *Theol. Quart.* 1845, p. 301.

50 Joseph. *Antiq.* xx. 5, 1; 8, 6. Langen, p. 437. Pascal, x. 4. Weiss I., 481.

it was part of the Messias' office to reform the lives of the people, to heal all their wounds and to satisfy all their wants. If suffering and death were a consequence of sin, then with sin they must be removed. The golden age of continuous peace and prosperity was to return. Such at least seems to be the external picture of the Messianic kingdom given by the prophets. If, however, we distinguish the meaning from the language which wraps it up, and separate the shell from the kernel, the religious purpose stands clearly forward. The miracles of Jesus when viewed in this light no longer appear as mere cures of the ills of the people, such as were expected of the Messias, but are rather the image of spiritual cures and an incentive to faith in Christ. In the Gospels this purpose is unmistakable. Whether we consider the publicity of the works or the prohibition to devulge them, the religious purpose, and the higher interests of faith were in both cases the determining cause. If Jesus had worked his miracles from pure benevolence, to relieve distress and misery, there would have been no need either for Jesus to work them in public, or for the evangelists to record them; nay the Messianic miracles themselves would then have to continue for all times. Hence we argue thus: Were this external view of Messianic prophecy correct, it could never have been wholly fulfilled; but if it is incorrect, the miracles of Jesus and the Gospel records must be read in a different light. As regards the Gospel of S. Matthew, it would seem that the significance of the miracles recorded therein lies wholly in proving Jesus to be the Messias. Clearly this is the purpose for which he writes. He thus sums up his story: "And Jesus went about "all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues; and preaching "the gospel of the Kingdom, and healing all manner of sick-"ness and every infirmity among the people."* The drift of the miraculous cures is expressed in the quotation from Isaias:† "He took our infirmities and bore our diseases,"‡ although

* iv. 13.
† Isaias liii. 4.
‡ Matth. viii. 17.

this can hardly be the immediate meaning of the passage.* But S. Matthew goes still further. With him miracles prove more than that Jesus was the Messias, for he relates† that Jesus healed the paralytic in order to shew that he had full power on earth to forgive sins. The Jews, failing to discern this purpose in the miracles, and the connection between the Messias and his divine character, raise a protest against his arrogance and blasphemy in claiming the power to forgive sins.‡ But by working a miracle expressly to confirm his words, Jesus made the outward sign a means of recognizing something higher, to wit, the power of God; and thereby he converts a miracle into a proof of his divinity. The dispute about the casting out of devils serves the same end.§ The confession of the disciples was also the effect of a miracle.||

In S. Mark's Gospel this significance underlying miracles stands out still more prominently. The evangelists' purpose is to prove Jesus to be the Son of God. And he proves his point, not so much by Scriptural argument, or the discourses of Jesus, but, as being more suited to his readers, by a vivid description of his works. This being so, we should naturally expect the central figure of the narrative to be Jesus in his capacity of miracle-worker. And yet it is not so. For the miracles are but a means to an end. Mark's reason for describing the miracles so graphically and so vividly was to bring them home to Roman readers, living far away from the scene of Jesus' labours, and thus to induce them to believe that Jesus was the Son of God. Hence, while passing over the Sermon on the Mount, he does not omit to insert Matthew's remark about the impression produced by the discourses of Jesus. "And they were "astonished at his doctrine. For he was teaching them as

* I. Peter ii. 22.

† ix. 6.

‡ ix. 3.

§ xii. 24.

|| xiv. 33.

"one having power and not as the scribes."* After Jesus' first miracle in the synagogue he again gives the impression produced on the multitude: "And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying: What "thing is this? What is this new doctrine? For with power "he commandeth, even the unclean sprits, and they obey "him.† The miracle then holds but a secondary place; it serves to confirm the doctrine which Jesus taught concerning himself and his mission. "Let us go," says Jesus to Simon, "into the neighbouring towns and cities, that I may preach "there also: for to this purpose am I come. And he was "preaching in their synagogues, and in all Galilee, and casting "out devils."‡ Through his whole gospel there breathes a spirit of admiration of the divine figure, who brought down from heaven a new doctrine, and set a seal on his mission by his miracles. It is noteworthy that Mark most regularly records the prohibition to publish the miraculous cures. This might perhaps be set down as an ordinary measure of precaution on our Lord's part; still the deeper reason of it must be sought in the signification of the miracles. Of themselves they cannot, nor are they intended to produce faith, § but they are a confirmation of Jesus' claims and doctrine.

Luke surveys miracles from another point of view; he regards them more as proofs and tokens of divine mercy and love. Jesus is the good Samaritan who came to bind up and to heal our wounds, to assuage our sorrows, and to relieve misery and distress. He is the good shepherd who goeth after the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and having found the sheep carries it back on his shoulders to the flock. He is the compassionate redeemer who gladdens publicans and sinners

* Mark i. 22. Matth. vii. 28.

† Mark i. 27.

‡ Ibid. i. 38-39.

§ The meaning of the author in this phrase must be gathered from what he says in chapter x. on miracles in general. Tr.

with his presence, and bestows on them his grace in the synagogue at Nazareth, by a reference to Isaias; Jesus porclaims this as his task, and this incident serves Luke as an heading for his account of the public ministry.* Like S. Paul, Luke has brought this view of the Messias' ministry forward, in order to depict the goodness and the kindness that appeared on the earth, when Jesus came to save men according to his mercy. Far from representing the merciful redeemer as a mere though wonderfully exalted man, he intends to draw the picture of the Son of God consumed with love, who emptied himself for man's salvation and gave himself up to death.

On the bearing of miracles in S. John's Gospel not many words need be expended, since the Apostle clearly indicates his own standpoint. † Miracles, in his eyes, are a motive for believing Christ to be the Son of God, in whom man finds eternal life. With this end in view he selects, from among the many miracles of Jesus, those which, from their extraordinary character, were admirably designed to show forth the majesty of the worker. And that majesty he conceives from the very first as the glory of the only-begotten Son of the Father. Never for a moment does he conceal that his intention, in bringing forward the miracles, is to establish the perfect Godhead of the Son, and his oneness of nature with the Father. This chief proposition of his Gospel he has clearly and distinctly set forth in the discourses of Jesus. There is one discourse, to which we have already directed attention, which lays down accurately the relation between miracles and doctrines. And the same connection may, without difficulty, be detected in the several discourses and narratives. All the miracles seem to be organically connected with the doctrines. When Jesus changed water into wine, he revealed his glory, and his disciples believed in him. The healing of the man who had been a cripple for eight-and-thirty years, appears as the outcome of that divine activity which

* vi. 16.
† John xx. 30.

the Son has exercised with his Father since the creation of the world. The cure of the man born blind is a ray of the divine light in Christ, which enlightens every man coming into this world. The raising of Lazarus is but one instance of the power of life in him who can say of himself: "I am the resurrection "and the life." The greater the miracles, and the more intimately they are connected with the doctrine of Jesus in regard to his person and mission, the more overwhelming must have been their force to move the mind and hearts of their hearers. And for this reason the fourth Gospel is a crushing condemnation of Jewish obstinacy and unbelief. Although Jesus had worked so many miracles before their eyes, they believed not in him. Inwardly, indeed, many believed in him, but dared not openly confess him for fear of the Pharisees, lest they should be cast out of the Synagogue. For they preferred to be honoured of men rather than of God. But just as the disciples and the man born blind arrived at faith in Jesus by reflecting on the bearing of his miracles on his doctrines, so, in the opinion of the Evangelist, all men of good-will who read the glory of the Son of Man will believe him to be the Son of God.

Does not our Lord, however, declare in this very Gospel that his miracles were worked by his Father's aid? Miracles, say even well-meaning critics, are no proof that Christ is Almighty God, because they were all worked by the Father's power.[52] The fourth Gospel, as we have often observed, in deference to Jewish monotheism lays stress on the fact that our Lord was sent by the Father. It is not therefore surprising if Jesus, before raising Lazarus, prays thus: "Father, I give thee thanks that "thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me "always, but because of the people who stand about have I "said it; that they may believe that thou hast sent me;"* especially if we remember that, just before, the Evangelist makes

52 Weiss, I. 323.
* John xi. 42.

our Lord say: "I am the resurrection and the life; he that "believeth in me, though he be dead, shall live."* Surely the candid reader needs no further proof that this prayer is not a denial of Jesus' powers, but that it was intended to teach the least intelligent among the Jews that Jesus acts in everything as the envoy of the Father whom all worshipped. More emphasis is laid on the unity of Father and Son than on the distinction. But, in the other miracles, this manner of speech is absent. To try and extract this meaning from certain of S. John's words is arbitrary and artificial. Some, for example, read it into the words addressed by Jesus to the ruler from Capharnaum: "Go thy way, thy son liveth." † Any one who follows the story will see at once that Christ had cured the boy instantaneously from afar. Christ, says Heracleon, said "he "liveth" rather than "he shall live" out of condescension and humility not from lack of power. According to Weiss this is a "word of promise," which God alone can fulfil, since He alone can work miracles; but even so, such a promise implies that between God and Christ there is a community of life, tantamount to divine Sonship. In the case of the man who had been infirm for thirty-eight years, and of the man born blind, even this miserable subterfuge is wanting. For from the words of the man made whole, "Now we know that God doth not "hear sinners &c.,"‡ we are not justified in arguing back to our Lord's mode of action. The man healed, when he spoke these words, had not yet recognized Christ. §

From this consideration of miracles one thing, at all events, is clear; that miracles, by themselves, detached from the words and discourses of Christ, are insufficient to prove Christ's divinity. His doctrine and works cohere, although the ordinary believer seems to judge otherwise. As God is known by

* Ibid. v. 25.

† John iv. 50.

‡ John ix. 31.

§ Ibid ix. 35-38.

creation, so now, the Fathers think, His works proclaim him the Lord of creation. He who healed the man born blind, could also create man ; he who changed water into wine, is also the Lord of the water.[53] Thus miracles, looked at in this light, are an immediate revelation of God's power and divinity. But in saying this much, the Fathers were tacitly leaning on those words in which Jesus declared that the works were his, as the Son of the Father ; otherwise they would have to ascribe the same attributes to the prophets, Elias and Eliseus. Nevertheless, when we view the work of Jesus as a whole, and consider the relation in which Christianity stood to decaying Judaism and dying heathenism, we cannot but acknowledge that the miracles of Jesus are a magnificent revelation of God in nature.[54] But, howsoever great be the impression the miracles produce, so long as an envoy of God can work them, they do not carry absolute conviction in themselves, but only when joined with our Lord's positive declarations.[55] "The Father worketh until now ; "and I work."* "For what things soever he doth, these the "Son also doth in like manner."† "For as the Father raiseth "up the dead and giveth life ; so the Son also giveth life to "whom he will."‡ Had he spoken untruly, he would have blasphemed, and the Father would not have aided and abetted his blasphemy with miracles. Such, at least, was the persuasion of those who wrote the gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles.[56] And the fact of Jesus giving his Apostles the power to work miracles furnishes a new proof, independently of Jesus' words, that the power was Jesus' own : "All power is given to me in "heaven and on earth."§ "As the Father hath sent me, I also "send you."‖

53 Möhler, *Athanas.* p. 164. See also *Apotheosis* of Prudentius.
54 Möhler, p. 165, 168. Vosen, p. 730.
55 Kleutgen, III. 468, 356, 363. Drey, II. 350.
56 Acts ii. 22 seq. ; iii. 13 ; v. 30 ; xiii. 27.
* John v. 17.
† Ibid. v. 19.
‡ Ibid v. 21.
§ Matth. xxviii. 18
‖ John xx. 21.

For completeness sake we here append in rough outline a sketch of the several classes of miracles that Jesus wrought. They are generally divided in *cures* and *nature-miracles*.* The first class may be again subdivided into curing the sick and raising the dead. S. Thomas' division is more dogmatic. He distinguishes miracles worked 1st on spirits (casting out devils), 2nd on bodies (the sun's darkness at his death) 3rd on men (cures), 4th on irrational creatures (nature-miracles). Inasmuch as sin brought sickness and death into the world, miracles are connected with redemption from sin. But as redemption from sin was the main object of the Incarnation, Christians are still afflicted with temporal punishment in this world, in order that they may thereby be made conformable to the Son, who had to enter into his glory by suffering and death. He who does not take up his cross and follow Jesus is not worthy of him. The disciple should not fare better than the master. Suffering and death become to believers, through patience and self-denial, a means of gaining heaven. But the divine grace of redemption has sweetened their bitterness, and they are sanctified by the example of the suffering redeemer. Hence the Apostle cries aloud: "O death where is thy sting? O Hell, where is thy victory." Sufferings and trials are short and pass away, and are not worthy to be compared with the glories which God hath prepared for them that love him. Jesus, as the Synoptists tell us, healed all manner of sickness, and cast out devils from all who were brought before him, but the sum total is proportionately small.

The miraculous cures have not been treated with such scant courtesy by the negative critics as the other miracles, because they seem most open to a natural explanation. But, as we have shewn, all attempts at natural explanations are labour lost. For, if we are to believe the Evangelists, Jesus designedly intended to work real miracles, and he appealed to them as such in proof of his doctrine.† The narratives, as they stand, lend no colour

* *Heilwunder* and *Naturwunder*.

† Matt. ix. 2; John v. 14; ix. 3.

to the view that Jesus first followed the profession of a physician, after the manner of the Essenes, to whose body he belonged. (?) From effecting numerous cures, which legend magnified into miracles, Jesus, it is said, by a transition, which, owing to the relations between soul and body was very natural, became a Physician of souls.[67] According to the Gospels, which we have shewn to be trustworthy records, the precise contrary is the case. Was it usual for Jewish rabbis to begin their career as physicians? Why, then, do the means employed in miraculous cures fall so far short of the effect?

Those from whom he cast out devils, Jesus delivered from spiritual death; those whom he raised to life, he delivered from the death of the body. Demoniacs, as such, according to the Gospel, do not suffer from epilepsy. Epilepsy, indeed, is often joined with possession; not, however, as its nature, but as an effect. The demon who speaks is clearly not the spirit of the person possessed. If passion can chain down the soul to sensuality, why should it be thought impossible for the Evil Spirit to make soul and body his pliant tool? Some men betray a diabolical malice in their actions. Why should it be impossible for the Evil One to reveal his power through physical phenomena? In sketching the character of Judas, S. John brings out the former point, while the latter is brought out by the Synoptists in their description of the casting out of devils. The frequency of possession at that time, to which Josephus and the Jewish exorcists mentioned in the Gospel allude, was undoubtedly connected with the near approach of redemption.

Three instances of raising from the dead are recorded in the Gospels. All the Synoptists relate the raising of the daughter of Jairus, Luke alone that of the young man of Nain, John alone that of Lazarus. The daughter of Jairus was just dead—only sleeping,—the young man was being carried out,

67 Labanca, *Il Christianismo primitivo*, Torino 1886. See L'hist. des relig. 1886 (xiii.) p. 290.

Lazarus had lain four days in the grave and the process of decomposition had set in. It was incumbent on the later Evangelists to put these miracles beyond all question. In truth if any miracle can prove the worker to be divine, it is the raising of a dead man to life. The objections raised against these miracles are generally directed not against their mere possibility, but against the credibility of fact and of the evidence alleged on its behalf. But behind this scepticism there always lurks a doubt as to the reality of the miracle, and in the Jews least of all was this excusable. Not only for them, however, but for all time the miracles of Jesus must be taken in connection with his doctrine and work. Thus they shew forth his dominion over nature, and are a proof of his divinity.

By nature-miracles are meant miraculous effects upon the elements. To the natural man these miracles seem to belong, in some sense, to a higher order. For the spiritual or physical contact that subsisted between the object and the worker in the miracles of healing, is here wholly absent. In no sense can the elements be said to be in man's dominion. Yet Jesus repeatedly asserted his power over the laws and forces of nature. He walked on the sea, without being carried under by force of gravitation; of a sudden he stilled the storm at sea; he changed water into wine, made the fig-tree wither, and fed five thousand with a few loaves. As to the natural explanations proferred by rationalists, on which we have already animadverted, they are almost more miraculous than the miracles themselves, and infinitely more incredible. For in the teeth of analogy, they handicap the course of nature with an exception, otherwise unknown to nature. An "accelerated process of nature" fails to make the instantaneous multiplication of loaves one whit more intelligible. What accelerated process of nature has ever been known to change water into wine? Wine manufacturers will be grateful for the receipt. When asked to explain the multplication of the loaves, the chemist shakes his head, and protests that he cannot make up the percription. The moral

explanation is quite as halting. Who, indeed, would rest content with the theory which sets it down as a work of benevolence, extending over a long period, and carried into effect by each one sharing his goods with his neighbour? Were the evangelists, perchance, in blank ignorance of all this? Is the miracle at Cana made one jot more easily understood, by supposing that Jesus merely made the water taste like wine?

Only one way remains of getting rid of these objectionable miracles, and that is to treat them as allegories: "As the "stories are told, there is nothing left but to accept them as "history or to treat them allegorically."[58] The evangelists, say the advocates of this hypothesis, intended to give prominence to the powers or attributes with which faith had embellished the portrait of Jesus. Thus besides fusing certain reminiscences they likewise freely invented stories with a substratum of fact. The example or fact then became a parable. Such, for instance, were the walking on the sea, the diabolical possession of the Gadarenes, and more especially the multiplication of bread. There is no question, they say, of inventing great and startling miracles to prove the power of the worker; these stories grew easily and naturally out of faith. That which faith believed concerning Jesus, the same it tried to expresss in allegory.[59]

But whence came this faith? and this portrait of Jesus? If these stories of miracles are really allegories of the overflowing faith of the whole Church, in which the Gospels took their rise, then this faith and this idea of the worker would be still more miraculous than the miracles themselves. This diluted "myth hypothesis" is not feasible unless the Gospels were free and easy compilations of a later date, and tradition were abandoned a prey to fancy. And even so it would not be probable, because the faith of the Church must be laid on deeper foundations. Moreover, these miracles are appealed to

58 Haupt. *Stud. u Krit.* 1887, p. 389.
59 Weizsäcker, p. 409.

by the Apostles themselves. So, the miraculous cures, which critics are, to a certain extent, willing to allow, will ultimately share the same fate, unless, indeed, the contention be set up that the nature-miracles belong to a "later period" of the Gospel narrative.

And, in truth, some have thought that the fact of the transfiguration and the two multiplications of loaves being the leading miracles at this time, sufficiently indicates the work of a later period. Here, they say, allegory is clearly in the ascendent, fact and action on the decline. "Here all representation "of what actually happened, as is the case in the cures . . "has ceased. We merely see what faith in Jesus, which created "these stories, wished and tried to express. . . . The rise "of such views can only be accounted for by their master becom-"ing an object of doctrine. This kind of teaching is founded "not on history, but on a symbolical account of his nature." As if the multiplication of the loaves would have formed a natural beginning for Jesus' work! The evangelists had due regard for their readers. There must be beginning, progress, and end, in their accounts. But, in point of fact, when we read e.g. Mark vi. 1-19, 13, we find the miraculous cures as much to the fore as in the first period. They and the nature-miracles go together, hand in hand. The fourth Gospel, which represents the latest period, records only three nature-miracles,* and four miraculous cures. Papias, indeed, in a well-known fragment introduces a Presbyter as saying that Peter shaped his preaching according to his hearers; but the man must be steeped to the ears in prejudice who so strains the words as to make them mean that Peter concocted stories to illustrate the faith. This destructive theory contains just one grain of truth: the religious purpose the evangelists had in view guided them in planning and arranging their narrative. The incidents that throw light on the one side of the portrait of Jesus, they grouped together. But they do not let drop the faintest hint that they

* ii. 1; vi. 1; xxi.

are allegorising. Rather they professedly tell their story as eye-witnesses, or from the accounts of eyewitnesses. So convinced were S. Paul and the Apostles of Christ's sovereignty over nature that they saw in it the weightiest argument that he was the Son of God, the Logos, the Creator, yea, Almighty God.

In addition to the miracles that Jesus worked himself it is usual to bring as proof of his divine nature and mission the miracles wrought in and for him. This distinction is based on Jesus being at once God and man. "If I bear witness of "myself," he says, "my witness is not true. There is another "that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness "which he witnesseth of me is true. . . . And the Father "himself who hath sent me, hath given testimony of me."* For proof of this we need not revert to the prophecies; the history of the sacred infancy and the chief moments in the life of Jesus suffice. The Father gave testimony of Jesus by foretelling his coming to Zachary, Mary, Joseph, by summoning the shepherds to the crib, by guiding the wise men from the East with a star to Jerusalem and Bethlehem, and by saving the divine child from Herod's wrath. He gave testimony of him by glorifying him at his baptism in the Jordan by a miraculous revelation, and by solemnly inducting him into his office; by acknowledging him for his beloved Son when he was transfigured before the disciples, by glorifying him in death, by raising him from the dead and taking him up to heaven in presence of his disciples. Hence the resurrection of Christ is usually represented as his re-awakening by the Father. Owing to this double character it is possible to refer the miracles to the Father without denying them to Jesus. The Father glorifies Jesus that the Son may glorify the Father, as he gives the Son power. In his death and resurrection Jesus again reclaims his glory, which the Father had given him, because the

* John v. 31-37.

Father loved him before the creation of the world.* This being glorified by the Father, crowns his work, life and doctrine; he came forth from God, and goes back again to the Father. "And when all things shall be subdued "unto him, then the Son also himself shall be subject "unto him that put all things under him, that God may "be all in all."†

* John xvii. 24.
† I. Cor. xv. 28.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE GOD-MAN.

To draw a true picture of Jesus is a most difficult task, and the reason is obvious. For not only is the Gospel narrative too fragmentary for this purpose, but Jesus Himself occupies so exalted and unique a position in the history of mankind, that any attempt to give even the bare outlines must necessarily fall short of the reality.

The disciples, his familiar companions, entranced by his personality, set aside every conception of him except those of Messias and Son of God. They paid, therefore, but little heed to any process of historical development or analysis of internal causes or motives. The preparation preceding his public life would only be of interest to them in so far as some wonderful incidents in it manifested his glory and his compassion.

For the same reason the Evangelists committed to writing those discourses and events alone which throw a clear light upon the superhuman and divine character of Jesus, though but one of them confesses in so many words that he has seen the glory as it were of the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.* Even Luke who dwells far more on the human side of the character of our Lord, considers all his actions as so many proofs of divine condescension and humiliation.

* John i. 14.

But even were the Gospel narratives more complete or written on a different plan from that which was adopted, it is doubtful whether our task would be an easier one; for the real difficulty lies deeper. It lies in this, that Christ who came in the fashion of man is God. But the nature of God is infinite and his attributes are absolute, and both are beyond the ken of man. How can the finite mind draw a picture of the infinite? And again the human nature of Jesus has been so influenced by the divine that it is entirely free from those spiritual imperfections from which no men as such are exempt. Nor is the Jesus who appeared on earth merely an individual man belonging to this or that family, tribe, or nation; rather he is the ideal man, the representative and universal possession of mankind. In him human nature is perfect. Its attributes and perfections, though not identical with one another or with his nature, as is the case with those of God, are nevertheless in the fullest and most perfect harmony. As man holds the highest place and is the most gifted among creatures, so Christ is the first among men,—the man κατ' ἐξοχήν in whom the whole race is as it were embodied,* and consequently he has the highest task assigned to him, the fulfilment of which supposes a superhuman nature.

It is from the very nature of things that the divine and the human, the infinite and the finite, the exalted and the lowly, are so intimately blended both in being and action that the divine may be said to shine through the lowliness of the humanity which tempers as it were the inaccessible light of the Godhead. It is in the nature of the infinite Godhead to communicate the fulness of its riches and to reveal its heavenly glory. But there is also an inborn striving in human nature after the infinite and eternal, and for union with the Godhead. The idea of the infinite (which the mind involuntarily abstracts from the finite), points to the absolute whose existence is implied in creation; the longing for eternal happiness in the

* Eph. i. 10.

absolute is evidence of the union of the finite with the infinite. But in Jesus this union is not only moral but physical, and therefore complete and perfect. He is perfect God and perfect man, and on account of this miraculous union he has been called the God-man from the days of Origen till now. It cost many a long struggle before theology and the Church defined in precise and distinct terms, the simple truths as taught in Scripture and tradition, of two natures in one person. The difficulty was indeed great. There was the danger lest, by laying too great stress on the human nature or the divine, the one or the other should suffer loss. Ebionites and Docetists* were the centres round which the struggle revolved till Arianism arose.

But even after it had been defined that the two natures with all their component parts were two perfect natures, there still remained the question of their mutual relations and intercommunion. Holy Scripture clearly represents Jesus in all his speeches and actions as one and the same person; it unhesitatingly ascribes divine and human actions to the same subject, now to the Son of God, and now to the Son of Man. But this makes it still more difficult to explain how two perfect natures are combined in one subject.

If the real union of the two natures is inadequately understood the unity of the subject or person is endangered; but if the unity of the person is exactly appreciated, then the distinction and integrity of the natures seem jeopardised. Nestorianism and Eutychianism were the two poles in the Christological controversies. When at last the Church defined the union of the two natures in one divine person, without separation or division, without absorption or transmutation, a long period elapsed before all the consequences of this definition were drawn out. In the first place what is known in theology as *communicatio idiomatum*, i.e. attributing the properties of one nature to the other in the concrete person of God the Son, had

* The Ebionites denied the divinity, the Docetists the real humanity of Christ. Tr.

to be clearly understood; next it was necessary to realize the two dis'inct wills and their respectve operations. Although, then, this unity of person would seem to make it impossible for us to represent his actions and life in their true light, yet on the other hand, the real permanence of both natures with all their powers enables us to fix at least the character of the earthly human life. The hypostatic union indeed will always make it appear superhuman, nevertheless it is a truly human character,—the character of the one ideal man on earth. The likeness of Jesus as delineated by the apostles, and as found in the life and teaching of the Church, is raised so high above us, and is of so marvellous a character, that we are unable to represent it to life. Students of the great masters gaze upon their works and ponder deeply over the details, not to discover by minute criticsm any weakness of conception or flaw in technique, but rather to drink in deeply, and with their whole soul the ideal which divine genius has realized.

Now there is no greater masterpiece than the portrait of our Lord in the Gospels. It cannot therefore be the business of his faithful disciples to point out such faults as are unavoidable in consequence of the nature of canvass and painter. We must rather rest in passive contemplation, and permit the object before our mind to produce its impression upon us. We must consider Christ as teacher and worker of miracles, as having died and risen again, and as he continues to live in the Church; we must not attempt to reduce him to our own standard of thought, but rather allow ourselves to be raised to his.[1]

But we can hardly begin our task without feeling anew the difficulties before us. Generally speaking, man's talent and genius is formed in retirement, his character amid the strife of the world; and neither of these is at once matured or fully formed from the first. Such is the law of development which holds good in both the intellectual and moral life of man. Education and training, circumstances and the spirit of the time are

1 Möhler, *Ges Schriften*, I. 142.

especially influential in forming the character of distinguished men. Every one is more or less a creature of circumstance. May we, then, admit a development of this kind in Jesus? Was he in any way influenced by his age, country or people? We are not going to attempt a purely theoretical answer to these questions, but we take it from those who were most intimately acquainted with the life of Jesus. After narrating his conception by the Holy Ghost, his birth at Bethlehem, his presentation in the Temple S. Luke goes on to say: "And the child grew, and waxed strong, full of wisdom, and the grace of God was in him."* And he repeats the same remark of the boy twelve years of age who had astonished the doctors in the temple: "And Jesus advanced in wisdom and age, and grace with God and men."† A comparison of these passages with Luke i. 80 where a similar remark is made relative to the growth of John the Baptist, seems to call special attention to human development; and John again had his type in Samuel, of whom we read that "the child "advanced and grew on and pleased both the Lord and "man."‡

However it is not our purpose to speak here of bodily development; nor should we mention it, had not the Docetists looked upon the human body of Christ as a phantom—an explanation which in connection with the Apocryphal Gospels has had its effect even upon some later Greek commentators. True there are a few passages, especially in St. John's Gospel,§ which give some support to those who attempted on Docetist principles to account for the disappearance of Jesus from the midst of his enemies; nor are examples wanting from the Fathers who speak as if all bodily conditions absolutely depended on his divine will. But all such attempts are extinguished by the clear simple wording of Holy Scripture.

* Luke ii. 40.

† ii. 52.

‡ I. Kings ii. 26.

§ John viii. 59; xi. 39. Cfr. Luke iv. 30.

The Gospel of John in particular emphasizes the nature of "flesh,"* while the other Evangelists also recognize in Jesus a perfect man, whose mother and brethren are known; who himself took a part in the wedding-feast at Cana; who, when fatigued, rested at Jacob's well; who was fired with holy indignation against his enemies, and was moved even to tears with heartfelt compassion for the friends of Lazarus. Then, also, the blood and water which flowed from the side of the dead Christ witnessed to the reality of his human nature.

Moveover, the development of body must be mentioned here for the further reason that in the passages quoted it is bound up with the development of the spiritual life of the soul. In all things, sin excepted, Jesus was found to be a man. Are we therefore justified in concluding that, like man, he underwent a spiritual development? A comparison of the passages of S. Luke, would seem to prove the answer to be in the affirmative. As Jesus advanced in age, so also he increased in wisdom before God and man. Luke is, moreover, precisely the one Evangelist who has not only given in a realistic manner special prominence to the corporeal side, but has likewise, with the greatest care, depicted the human spiritual activity of Jesus. He relates how Jesus was wont to withdraw into solitude, and to ascend the mountains, in order to hold communion with his Father, and how he spent whole nights in prayer.† This reminds us how, in the picture of Jesus in the Epistle to the Hebrews, prominence is given to the lowliness and weakness of our High Priest as man, in order to set before the eyes of suffering and persecuted Christians a loving protector and an encouraging model in the person of a suffering redeemer. "For in that, wherein he "himself hath suffered and been tempted, he is able to succour "them also that are tempted."‡ "For we have not a high priest, "who cannot have compassion on our infirmities; but one

* John x. 14.
† Luke v. 16; vi. 12; ix. 18.
‡ Heb ii. 18.

"tempted in all things like as we are without sin."* "Who, in "the days of his flesh, with a strong cry and tears offering up "prayers and supplications to him that was able to save him "from death, was heard for his reverence. And whereas, indeed, "he was the Son of God, he learned obedience by the things "which he suffered: and being consummated, he became, to "all that obey him, the cause of eternal salvation." †

Justice is not done to these passages by explaining them of a gradual outward manifestation of the spiritual character of Jesus, which was complete from the first. Nor, again, is justice done to them by those who assume that he possessed from the beginning all knowledge by virtue of the '*visio beatifica*,' as the Scholastics call it, and that he also gradually acquired the same knowledge by experience *(scientia experimentalis acquisita)*. This theory of the twofold mode of cognition can only be regarded as an attempt to harmonize the dogma of the complete human nature of Christ with that of his divinity, lest the divine knowledge should be thought to destroy the human. For the human will and the human activity would be meaningless if at all times and in every action the divine will and the divine activity alone prevailed. One thing only is absolutely excluded by Holy Scripture, namely the idea of progress from worse to better. At all times and in all circumstances the acts of Jesus are in all respects perfect and his knowledge without error. In this way there is that perfect accord between the human knowledge and will and the divine, which the unity of person demands, whether with S. John Damascene and many realistic schoolmen,[8] we call the person of Christ *divine-human*, or, to prevent all misunderstanding, adhere to the usual expression 'divine person.'

The Apocryphal Gospels are chiefly concerned with the infancy of our Lord, and the authors delight in making it

8 Schwane, *Dogmengesch.*, II. 529. Bach, *Dogmengesch.* II 400, 542, 648.

* Hebr. iv. 15.

† Ibid. v. 7-9.

as marvellous as they can. The temptation to do so was but natural even apart from any heretical tendencies. For, on the one hand, the evangelists have passed over the greater part of this period in silence; and, on the other, in the little they relate, they dwell chiefly on what is divine; that is, in so far as the facts recorded, though in themselves human, have a divine significance as a preparation for realizing the work of redemption. But these Gospels cannot be of any value or use to us in drawing the portrait of Jesus. From allusions made by the evangelists we may gather that the people of Nazareth had no idea of his divine mission, much less of his divine nature. To them he is the carpenter's son —the carpenter. No prophet is acceptable in his own country S. Luke likewise gives us to understand that the Blessed Virgin was careful to keep the secret entrusted to her, for he twice remarks that she kept all these things in her heart.*

Again, we infer from the Gospels that Jesus did not receive what we should familiarly term a liberal education; such at least seems to be the inference we should draw from the passage in St. John: "How doth this man know letters having "never learned?"† This does not mean that Jesus did not, according to the ordinary custom of the Jews, receive instruction at home, or hear the law and the prophets read and explained in the Synagogue But it shows that his knowledge of Scripture was far greater than that which he could have gained from common instruction, or by frequenting a Rabbinical school in Jerusalem Hence the astonishment of the Doctors in the temple at the wisdom shown by his questions and answers when he was but twelve years of age;‡ and this contrast between his knowledge and his education must have become more conspicuous, when he undertook his ministry and publicly announced that the kingdom of God was

* Luke i. 19. 51.
† John vii. 15.
‡ Luke ii. 46. 47.

at hand. What a revelation of wisdom is the sermon on the Mount! Like a second Moses he promulgates the New Law wherein he lays down for individuals as well as for the community at large, an unparalleled standard of action, regulating the internal life of thought and desire, as also the external relations of man towards God and his neighbour. Again in simple parables from nature and the life of men, he shrouds or reveals the mysteries of the kingdom of God, the errors of the ways of sin, and the marvellous paths of divine grace,—shrouds them, that is, from those who have eyes and see not, and ears and hear not, but reveals them to those to whom it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God. In homely but pregnant images, in words simple but full of import, Jesus knew how to reveal to his hearers the whole history of his kingdom till the end of time. In a story without colour, but incisive and full of pathos, he depicts the heart of man going astray and returning again by the grace of God, thereby giving to his hearers a surprising insight into their own inner life. Whether in severe and forcible rebuke he holds up to scorn the malice of his enemies, or in loving condescension instructs the disciples concerning the things of the kingdom of God, and comforts them for the lot which awaits them in the world, we see everywhere the same divine wisdom. Simple as he is sublime, natural in his expressions but unsurpassed in depths of thought, he solves the most difficult problems, reducing them to their initial principles with a clearness and freshness that astonished his hearers. Without any skill in dialectic, without the art of rhetoric or philosophy, he grasps everything with sure intuition and sets it forth with winning simplicity. Even if we did not possess the accounts of the subtle disputes in the fourth Gospel, we should still marvel at his use of polemics in those related by the Synoptists. The result is pithily summed up by S. Matthew in the words: "And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any

3 Haupt, *Zur Individualität Jesu*, in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1887, p. 375.

"man from that day forth ask him any more questions."*

But the ideal man must have true wisdom as well as mere knowledge. The distinction between theoretical and practical knowledge is now and was unknown to the old world. In Holy Scripture truth and wisdom are always taken as practical, and as they are exercised in ordinary life. "The truth," said Jesus to his disciples, "shall make you free;" his own life and person must have been a proof of it. Let us first consider then what freedom is; and we shall best arrive at an answer by considering what it is not, namely, the subjection of man to the dominion of the world, the flesh and the devil, sin and concupiscence. Freedom then consists in renunciation of the world, and in subduing sensuality and concupiscence. Freedom is sinlessness, and Christ was sinless, and Christ alone of all mankind. Sinlessness was the basis of the whole work of redemption, for he only who knew no sin could take on himself the sins of others; only he who never groaned under the yoke of his own sins could break this yoke for the world; he only in whom Satan had no part could destroy the dominion of the devil. "For every high priest "taken from among men, is ordained for men in the things that "appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices "for sins; who can have compassion on them that are ignorant "and that err: because he himself also is compassed with "infirmity: and therefore he ought, as for the people, so also for himself to offer for sins."†

Holy Scripture declares directly and indirectly the sinlessness of Jesus. He himself puts the question to the unbelieving Jews "Which of you shall convince me of sin?"‡ S. Paul cannot conceive the idea of a redeemer from sin who was himself a sinner. "Him, that knew no sin, for us he hath made "sin, that we might be made the justice of God in him."§ We

§ II. Cor. v. 21. Cf. Rom. v. 18. Phil. II. 8.

* Matth. xxii. 46.

† Heb. v. 1.

‡ John viii 46.

have already quoted the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews as excluding sin from the human nature of the High-Priest of the New Covenant.* "For it was fitting "that we should have such a high priest, holy, innocent, "undefiled, separated from sinners and made higher than "the heavens."† St. Peter writes: "For unto this are "you called; because Christ also suffered for us, leaving "you an example that you should follow his steps; who "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth;"‡ and S. John who calls the man a liar who should say of himself that he is without sin, writes of our Lord: "and you "know that he appeared to take away our sins and in him "there is no sin."§

Indirectly Holy Scripture teaches the sinlessness of Jesus throughout its pages by showing how the disciples were captivated by his spotless purity, and how his enemies strove by every means in their power to prove the contrary. Not that the disciples idealized their beloved master, nor did the saying "de mortuis nil nisi bene" have any weight with the biographers of Jesus.[5] Their idea of him was formed during those three years in which they continued in his presence and listened to his words; and if in spite of being persecuted and outlawed by the Jews they stood by the master who had the words of eternal life, they must have been convinced before his death of the perfect purity of his character which they had seen so often assailed in vain by the malice of his foes. Had it been otherwise, the worldly maxim quoted above would not have helped to convince them of it. The resurrection alone was able to restore the full conviction in the minds of the downcast disciples. But a belief in the resurrection implies of necessity a belief in the sinlessness of him who had risen from the dead.

5 Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 240.

* Heb. iv. 15.

† vii. 26.

‡ I. Pet. ii. 21.

§ I. John iii. 5.

Again, had the disciples merely tried to idealize their master after death, surely the misfortunes that befell them afterwards, must have radically cured them of this extravagance. Besides, their own Jewish faith and knowledge of the Old Testament had taught them that sin is the inheritance of all mankind, and their own missionary experience had helped to bring the universal ravages of sin before their eyes. What else but the clear and certain conviction of the absolute contrast between Jesus and the rest of men, in this respect, could have prevented them from mentioning a blemish, had they recollected one in him?

Nor would the Evangelists have succeeded in the task of hiding every blemish, had it been their intention to do so. The shadow follows too closely upon the light. How could they, unskilled and unpractised as they were, have drawn a picture at once so human and so perfect? These unskilled artists were chosen, so Origen thinks, in order to prove the veracity of Scripture.[6] The example of Xenophon is a case in point. Has he succeeded in drawing the portrait of an ideal man? Is the hero of his *Memorabilia* sinless? In the eyes of the Greeks, perhaps, the fault of Socrates did not mar the beauty of the portrait drawn by Xenophon; theirs was not the absolute standard of morality. The fact is that Xenophon never thought he had described the ideal and sinless man, or, indeed, that he could describe him. No man can, unless he has first seen the reality. Christ was the reality of the ideal man. The disciples had seen it and described it. The evangelists, furthermore, have enabled us to see Christ as his enemies saw him. They faithfully record the charges brought against him by the Pharisees and Scribes, who accused him of blasphemy, because he forgave sins * and called himself the Son of God.† But the very accusation condemns itself, since it is entirely grounded on

6 *C. cels.* III. 39.
* Matth. ix. 2-6; Luke ii. 5; Luke v. [illegible]
† John x. 36; Matth. xxvi. 65.

the fact that they refused to believe what he so clearly taught by word of mouth and by his works—namely, that he was truly the Son of God. Moreover, had there been the slightest truth in it, such pretensions, besides being a stain upon his character, would make Jesus the most wicked of imposters—an inference which even the boldest infidel would hardly presume to draw. Another accusation brought against him and recorded by the four evangelists * was the violation of the Sabbath-day. No doubt, from a Jewish point of view, to do any works of healing on this, the day of rest, was a great sin; but Jesus explains to them that the precept to do no work on the Sabbath-day was neither theoretically absolute, since the Father worketh even now; nor practically so, because they themselves admitted necessary exceptions to it. He healed the sick on the Sabbath precisely in order to show them that he was Lord also of the Sabbath. Hence he met their charges as only one who was himself God could meet them.

It may be objected, however, that the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan is a proof against his sinlessness; for John preached "the baptism of penance unto the remission of sins," and it is stated that all Judæa and Jerusalem went out to be baptized by him, confessing their sins!

The passage describing the baptism of Jesus is as follows: "Now it came to pass, when all the people was baptized, that "Jesus also being baptized, and praying, heaven was opened." † Now it is curious to note that neither Mark nor Luke attribute to Jesus any confession of sin, and this seeming omission finds a positive explanation in the voice from heaven. The Father's beloved Son cannot need any cleansing from sin from the Baptist. Matthew forestalls the supposition by narrating that John attempted to dissuade Jesus from his purpose: "I ought to be baptized by thee," he says to him, "and comest thou to "me? And Jesus answering said to him: Suffer it to be so

* Matth. xii.; Mk. ii. 23; iii. 2-4; Luke vi. 1-9; xiii.; xiv.; John v. 9; vii. 22; ix. 14.
† Luke iii. 21.

"now. For so it becometh us to fulfil all justice."* This explanation of his baptism cannot signify merely that Christ wished to furnish an example for Christian baptism, or that he washed away our sins in the Jordan, or that he sanctified the water and imparted to it the power of cleansing from sin all who should be baptized. Nor again is it sufficient to say that it was done to confirm the work of the Baptist, or to elevate and strengthen the inner soul of Jesus for his Messianic work. On the contrary both the words of our Lord and the revelation of the Father show that the baptism was predetermined as the necessary and solemn installation of the Messias in his office, and in order to show that prophecy in its last representative, John, was now closed and the Messianic kingdom begun. For Jesus himself it was the close of his hidden life and the inauguration of his public ministry, that is the work of the redemption. He therefore begins by taking upon himself the semblance of sin in obedience to his Father's will. This, then, was the beginning of that obedience by which he, the sinless redeemer, blotted out our sins. Thus there can be no question of any consciousness of sin on his part; nor could the people suspect sin in him, especially when they saw that he, unlike the rest, made no confession, and that his baptism was the scene of so marvellous a revelation from above, which was vouchsafed neither for Jesus alone nor for John alone, but for both and for the people.

Here, however, we must meet a general objection. It may be said that our proof of Christ's sinlessness is taken entirely from a consideration of what is external in his character, while what is internal is passed over and still remains hidden. Such is the contention of Strauss, Renan and others who urge that no man can possibly be free from sin, because no man is wholly free from evil inclinations, human passions and weaknesses. We have already admitted the truth of this general proposition, if applied to man corrupted by original sin; but we do not

* Matt. iii. 14.

admit that it is true absolutely and in every case. Surely the possibility of man being preserved from original sin by a special grace of God, is a truth equally undeniable, not only for the believer, but for any one who acknowledges the goodness and wisdom of the Creator. Moreover, in the case of Jesus there are other and higher reasons that exempt him from the sinful corruption of human nature. His heavenly origin, his supernatural conception, his divine mission lift him out of and above the sinful race. But even apart from these considerations, it is not true, as a matter of fact, that the Apostles regarded and described what is external in the character of Jesus only; and that we are reduced to the simple process of drawing conclusions from his outer to his inner life. For the rest, such a conclusion is perfectly legitimate and not to be despised. We are quite aware that moral greatness is perfectly compatible with certain internal struggles, but we contend that Christ's moral perfection was so great and exalted that the general principle cannot be applied to him.

The Apostles, we say, have as a matter of fact, given us an insight into the inner life of our Lord. Not only did Jesus many times, and especially at the last supper, manifest that purity of heart which no sin can sully, but he likewise proclaimed the sinfulness of all men[7] in opposition to his own sinlessness. And what he meant by sinlessness we learn from his declaration that in his law even an impure thought or desire, a feeling of hatred are sinful. Was not this calling their attention to a great contrast between himself and the rest of mankind? Was it not likewise inviting the disciples to read his inmost thoughts? Often as Jesus in his preaching exhorts to penance and prayer for the remission of sins, still we know of no such prayers or practices of penance for himself. Would this be consistent with the sublime character of one conscious of sinful passions? Would not our Saviour's humility thereby fall under suspicion? Would he ask others to do what he

7 Math. vi. 12; vii. 11; xviii. 24. Mark i. 15.

refused to do himself, though he were equally in need of it? No! the character of Jesus becomes utterly unintelligible if a human weakness was hidden in the recesses of his heart. He was sinless, and his sinlessness is the necessary basis of Christianity, whose business it is to free man from sin. So much, then, for the negative side of his character.

In order to describe the positive side of Christ's moral character we must take into consideration his position in life. With regard to the early period we have but one incidental remark for which we are indebted to S. Luke: "And he went down with them and came to Nazareth and "was subject to them."* But how much is contained in these few words! A divine child in the cottage at Nazareth subject to human parents in all things! What a beautiful picture! what a pattern for youth! We behold him, as it were, receiving orders from his blessed mother, going to work with the foster-father God had given him, and, as he passed for the carpenter's son, himself becoming a carpenter. As an obedient son he has set before all children a model; as an industrious carpenter he has blessed and sanctified handicraft and labour. In ancient times manual labour was despised and considered unworthy a free man. But our Redeemer himself laboured and thereby ennobled labour. The Apostles laboured; S. Paul earned his living by the work of his hands and enunciated the great principle: "He who labours not, neither should he eat."

There is one feature in this quiet family life which we should hardly need to touch upon had it not been so strangely misapprehended. Jesus never entered the state of marriage, although the law prescribed that the young Israelite should marry early. How is this certain fact to be accounted for? "The fact that Christ did not complete his life by marriage," says Schleiermacher, "seems to detract from the conception of him as "a perfect model, and is a point of no little difficulty."

* ii. 51.

and Hase[8] says "We require a moral reason why Christ, though "competent, did not marry. By Jewish custom marriage "was a duty especially for the first born of a family. Now "the question has frequently been asked why the man in "whose moral perfection Christianity believes, refrained from "marriage, which had certainly been the object of his considera-"tion, inasmuch as he proclaimed its ideal character as an "indissoluble contract in opposition to the wantoness of the "Jews in putting away their wives." Hase then continues in the following strain: Various reasons have been brought forward in answer to the question. Reasons ideal, ascetical and even civil; the labours of his office as teacher also, and the presentiment of an early and violent death have been urged; but the last two reasons clearly do not apply to the long peaceful years preceding his public life. A married man, too, might have borne the brunt of the storm equally well. The ideal reasons seem more to the point. The mind of Jesus, no doubt, was quite absorbed in his ideas, so that the thought of personal and domestic happiness never occurred to him; although, be it noted, the marriage state is not purely a selfish one, but has also a wider and even a religious importance. Nor have we any reason to consider that the dignity of the Redeemer is incompatible with marriage. It only seems so to us who are wont to think of him as something more than man. This reason indeed could only hold good, as it does in the Catholic Church, on the supposition that celibacy was a higher state. But even then it would have been a blessing if Jesus as well as Peter had married, because, in that case, all monkery and celibate clergy and all such human sacrifices would have been avoided. We must therefore conclude, as there are no general cogent reasons, the only feasible answer to the question is that it was owing to some peculiarity or accident of his youth that God had created no wife for him. Perhaps she who had been betrothed to him was carried off by death. So far Hase. We are, then, to suppose, according to this view, that Jesus,

8 Hase, p. 385

so obedient to his heavenly Father, and in all things guided by Him, was left to chance in a most important matter; that he was devoid of that foresight which is so characteristic of him in all other things; that he made himself the model of virgins and pure souls without rhyme or reason, and was thus the cause of an untold number of human sacrifices. In truth, a lower view could not well be imagined, nor a poorer answer given than that of Hase.

The ideal reasons, surely, arising from his person and office, must be plain to every thoughtful Christian. Jesus would never be the ideal man if chance had shaped his life. He would not be the spiritual head of mankind if he had been the founder of any but a spiritual race. He would not be the Messias of all men had he not been free both from Jewish sectarianism and the ties of family. The sharp contrast drawn by S. Paul between the first and second Adam, and between the law and grace, makes it impossible to conceive of Jesus, the Son of God, as a link in the chain of generations according to the flesh. And, indeed, the nature even of his conception excluded him from such a position. Again, it is certain that the state of virginity, however we may view the undoubted teaching of Jesus and the Apostles on that subject, is founded on the example of our Lord. It was their new calling that made the Apostles leave wife and children. This office and work demand the whole man, and if he have other cares his interest is divided: he that is without a wife, is solicitous for the things of the Lord, how he may please God; but he that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world how he may please his wife; hence his interest is divided. But behind it all there lingers the idea of virginity itself as a state of perfection that leads to heaven, where men neither marry nor are given in marriage—to the white-robed army before the lamb of those who have not defiled themselves with women. Marriage is a divine institution; it is holy; but Christian feeling shrinks from associating the idea with the Son

of God and Redeemer of mankind.* To his own mother, at the marriage feast in Cana he says: "Woman, what is "it to me and to thee" in order to signify his severance from all earthly ties; and again, on another occasion when told that his mother and brethren were without: "Who "is my mother, and who are my brethren? And stretch-"ing forth his hand towards his disciples he said: Behold "my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do "the will of my Father that is in heaven, he is my brother, "and sister, and mother."† And when a woman from the crowd called the mother of Jesus blessed, he answered: "Yea rather blessed are they who hear the word of God "and keep it."‡

This severance from family ties is but a consequence of his severance from all things earthly. The Son of God made use of human nature and his connection with earth only in so far as was necessary to fulfil his work of redemption, and to raise human nature to a participation of the divine. Having willed to be born of a pure virgin he chose one who was poor and unknown, in distant Nazareth, in despised Galilee. Although the wise men from the East brought royal gifts, still the King of Israel willed to be born in a stable, to receive his first homage from shepherds, to flee into Egypt from the tyrant's anger, and to live a hidden life in Nazareth. The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has not where to lay his head. He whom the angels of heaven obey became poor of his own free will in order to be of service to man, and to enrich our poverty. To the poor he preached the Gospel as well by example as by word. The kingdom he came to establish was not of this world, nor were the disciples to seek it among this world's goods. Considering

* The attention of the Catholic student may also be called to the peculiar relation between Christ and his sacred mother, who, as Scheeben so beautifully explains, was *mater-sponsa* Christi. See Scheeben, *Dogmatik*, vol. iii. b.v. cap. v. *Tr.*

† Matt. xii. 48.

‡ Luke xi. 38.

how great was man's attachment to such goods, how tenaciously the ancients, and not least among them the Jews, clung to earthly possessions, it was all the more necessary for men to see a practical example of complete renunciation. Not without a purpose does S. Luke pay special regard to these Ebionitic traits in the life of Jesus. Poverty on earth, riches in heaven. On earth the unrighteous mammon, in heaven an imperishable treasure. Our Lord's words to the tempter were the maxim of his whole life: "It is written: the Lord thy "God shalt thou adore and him only shalt thou serve." We cannot serve two masters, God and mammon. Jesus served his master in heaven.

Being free then from all anxiety as to earthly things, Jesus devoted himself to the work of charity and the love of his neighbour, and though he possessed not the ordinary means of benevolence and depended on others for the supply of his wants, nevertheless this did not hinder him from being a benefactor in a far higher sense; for Jesus could ask his foes: "Many good works I have shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do you stone me."* He had gone about the land of Judæa doing good. He had healed the sick, fed the the hungry, raised the dead, and shown love and grace to all. He had converted sinners and won them to God, and prayed for those who persecuted him. And when he said that in almsgiving the left hand should not know what the right hand doeth, he himself admirably put in practice this unselfish charity. To all he offers his gifts; he lovingly goes in quest of the lost sheep, and speaks to them words of comfort and of love. But he never thrusts himself forward; he goes away when he finds the soil not fertile. Only when malice and obstinacy unblushingly block the way, does he not forbear to speak earnest, severe and cutting words in order to put his adversaries to shame. And although Jesus restricted his activity to Palestine, yet he embraced with equal love all men—Jews, Samaritans,

* John x. 32.

and Gentiles. He wishes to be the good Shepherd; he includes all in the prayer he makes as the great high-priest, that they may be one, as he and the Father are one.

How many and great were the sacrifices required before Jesus had accomplished his work! The humility and self-denial of the Son of God who laid aside his glory and appeared in the form of a servant, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross, are alone sufficient to show forth the surpassing greatness of moral heroism in the character of Jesus. From his birth and circumcision till his last breath on the Cross, his life is one continuous path of humiliation and suffering. "Learn of me for I am meek and humble of heart."* His whole life in word and in deed was founded on humility—a motive of action quite unknown to the ancient world. He walked amid the snares and persecutions of his enemies, and the terrible end was ever present to his eyes. As in the beginning of his public ministry he had vanquished the temptations of earthly honour, and power, so on the Mount of Olives he wrestled with the agony of death till drops of bloody sweat ran down his face to the ground. He was to do not his own will, but the will of his Father. He allowed a traitor from among his disciples to betray him with a kiss to his enemies. He offered no resistance when he was bound, led away, mocked, scourged and crucified. What a painful scene for the suffering Redeemer, crowned with thorns and clad in a purple garment, when the proud haughty Roman brought him before the raging multitude of Jews thirsting for his blood, with the words: "*Ecce homo!*" Behold the man! Bespattered with blood he carried his Cross to the place of crucifixion and fell beneath his load. He stretched out his hands to be pierced, and was hanging for three hours between heaven and earth, tortured with pain and thirst, and mocked by his enemies. Of a truth, so the just one dies, and no one takes it to heart. A grander tragedy than that enacted on Calvary the world has never seen. No word of re-

* Matt. xi. 28.

proach or complaint escapes his lips. The victim of injustice and hatred knows only mercy and pardon. The Crucified promises to the repentant thief that he shall this day be in Paradise. He prays his Father to forgive his tormentors, for they know not what they do. He is solicitous for his mother, standing at the foot of the Cross, whose soul the sword of sorrow had pierced. Now he could exclaim: "It is consummated," for he had glorified his Father on earth by finishing the work that the Father gave him to do.* What now of Plato, Socrates, and all the wise men! What comparison is there between this painful and heroic death of the sinless Redeemer and the preparing to drink hemlock in a social gathering of friends?

Was there ever a man upon whom the things of earth and sense, and sin left no mark whatever? Where do we find majesty and dignity blended in such beautiful harmony with humility and self-denial? There is no other example in which every virtue meets to form a picture of so perfect a moral symmetry. The same sweet serenity, the same undisturbed tranquillity whether in joy or in sorrow, in temptations or struggle, whether with his familiar friends or in presence of the Sanhedrim, of Pilate or the Cross! Men have tried, but in vain, to explain such an example as purely human. Long ago S. Jerome replied to the Pelagians: "For to have all things and to need none, could belong alone to him who did no sin, nor was guile found in his mouth."[9] St. Augustine thought, indeed, at first, that man with God's grace, might live a sinless life; but he added that no man but Christ *is* without sin. He challenges Plato and the wisest men of antiquity to say whether they dare explain the teaching and life of Jesus as purely human. And Augustine is convinced that Plato would answer: "No! it is not possible that any man should do this, unless by the power and wisdom of God he be first lifted above the

9 *Adv. Pelag.* I. Cf. *de peccat. mer. et rem. II.*; *de vera relig.* c. 3. Plinius, *Hist. Nat.* vii. 40. Epictetus, *Diss.* II. 12, 19.

* John, xvii. 4.

ordinary course of nature, and enlightened from the very beginning by divine grace, and strengthened by divine power, so as to be a person of such exalted majesty and virtue that he despises what others seek, suffers what others shrink from, does what others most admire, and thus by love and authority draws mankind to the same saving faith." No mortal, Pliny thinks, is wise always. Epictetus considers it impossible to be free from faults. To strive to be free from them is, in his judgment, the highest goal that man can reach.

Recently the attempt has often been made to explain the ideal character of Jesus by the fusion of Eastern and Western genius. Jesus, it is said, is the ideal who unites in himself the wisdom of the West that rises above the pains and restlessness of earth, with the deep feeling of dependence on the divine power peculiar to the East. Given the stoical power of martyrdom and the deep religious sense of Judaism, we have all the possibilities of a perfect man! There is nothing further required but that the founder of our religion become conscious of the fact that the transcendental Godhead is immanent in man. This he actually did when he said "I and the Father are one." From that moment the fusion of Stoicism with the Christian idea was complete and was able to effect that change which is necessary in order to make religion an active agent in the life of man.[10] But, we ask, what has Stoicism to do with Christ? Whence comes that pure fire of the Eastern religious spirit which we see in no others, not even the prophets, to the same degree? No other preserved such repose amid the highest enthusiasm, such inflexible patience amid persecution and suffering, such absolute resignation to the divine will at all times, and in all circumstances, such pure love for friends and enemies. The Stoic was no ideal, not even with the heathen. Cicero thus laments: "We have no tangible and well-defined model of true "justice and genuine righteousness. We have only "shadows and outlines, and would to God we followed

10 Friedlieb, p. 76.

"these!"[21] "A perfect just man has not yet appeared on "earth. Philosophy can only teach the qualities such a "one must possess, if ever he is to appear on earth."[22]

Jesus alone could say to his disciples: "Follow me!" He alone could command them to do as he did; because he is indeed the model of all men of all conditions, who seek the kingdom of God and its justice. And he is the model because being both God and man, he united the lowliness of humanity with the majesty of God. In the foregoing explanation we have not been anxious to distinguish closely what belongs to the human and what to the divine nature in the same subject. In this we have followed the lines of Holy Scripture, which everywhere exhibits Christ as the perfect man, and Jesus as the eternal Son of God. It is not the business of an apologist to distinguish strictly between the properties of each; his object is rather to portray vividly their mutual interchange of operations. Even the disputes as to the development and progress of Jesus in wisdom may be left to dogmatic theology. It is enough to have pointed out the two con demned poles of error: Nestorianism, which separates the attributes and teaches only a moral union, and Monophysitism (Eutychianism) which obliterates the essential distinction. What lies between these two extremes may, without injury to Christian faith, be left to the enquiry of scientific theology.

In the God-man, too, the whole work of our redemption is, as it were, incorporated. This explains why that work exercises so great an influence upon the hearts of men. The work of the redemption, consisting as it does in *uniting* the divine and the human—God with man—is but a continuation of the hypostatic union or of the Incarnation; it is, in the words of the Apostle, the growing of the body of Christ to the fulness of age. What is earthly, sinful and powerless must be purified, strengthened, raised to heaven and deified; while the yearning

21 *De Offic.* III. 17, 69. See Mach, *Nothwendigkeit der Offenbarung*, p. 136, 252.
22 Cicero, *Tusc.* II. 22, 51.

of the human heart for union with the supreme good must be satisfied. The union of man with God, of the creature with the Creator, of the child with the Father, is that for which all have ever longed.[13] Jesus Christ is at once the pattern and the cause of that union of man with God. Hence all treasures of knowledge are hidden, that is, contained in him ; and to know him is man's supreme perfection, or as Tertullian says, "Christum scire est omnia "scire."

It lies outside our province to set forth the work of Christ from every point of view. From the time of Eusebius it has been usual to regard the work which the Son of God accomplished for man's redemption, under the triple aspect of his prophetical, sacerdotal and royal office. Here we only purpose to consider the admirable wisdom of God by which he has provided for the salvation of man in the work of the Incarnation. And first as to the doctrine and teaching of Jesus. Not only is it far above all heathen wisdom,[14] but it is also specially calculated to give contentment and peace to a mind desirous of truth, whether high or low, learned or unlearned ; because Christ taught with authority and in a form intelligible to all alike.

As God he possessed all truth and could impart it to man ; as man he could condescend to man's capacity and clothe truth in a form that should be intelligible even to the mind of a child. These two qualities of the Christian faith must especially strike the apologist when he compares the Christian religion with the sects of philosophers who found it difficult to discover the truth about God, and still more difficult to impart it to men.

The Christian religion has made the doctrines of God and His attributes living realities. Not only does it explain the fundamental truths taught in the Old Testament in regard to God's creation and guidance of the world ; but it gives a deeper appreciation of monotheism by the teaching of three persons in one nature ; and this leads us into the inner nature and life of God, and renders these

13 Aug., *Conf.* I. 1. See John iv. 14.
14 Kleutgen, III. 395, 406.

truths fruitful for practical faith. Again the infinite charity of God becomes visible and evident to all in the mystery of the Incarnation. What the ancients could never understand is now plain, namely that "God is Love."* By this mystery pride and vanity are overcome, the wall of separation between peoples is thrown down, the knowledge of divine truths exalted and increased, the love of God and neighbour elevated into a supreme command. All men without distinction are ennobled and sanctified in the one holy Son of Man, as brothers of Christ, children of God, and co-heirs of life eternal.

Moreover, with his infinite charity also, the justice and sanctity of God have been revealed by the Incarnation and the sacrifice of the Cross. If such a sacrifice on the part of God the Son was necessary in order to appease the Father's anger and expiate the guilt of man, how hateful must sin be in God's sight! How gladsome to the heart of man torn by sin must be the sound of the gospel of grace, redemption, and reconciliation in the Crucified Redeemer. Neither heathenism nor Judaism could lead man from sin to justice. Therefore God sent His Son to be a sin-offering for many. "God so loved the world as "to give his only begotten Son."† "When the goodness "and kindness of God Our Saviour appeared, not by the "works of justice, which we have done, but according to "his mercy he saved us."‡ "But all things are of God, "who hath reconciled us to himself by Christ, and hath "given to us the ministry of reconciliation. For God in-"deed was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not "imputing to them their sins, and he hath placed in us "the word of reconciliation. For Christ therefore we are "ambassadors, God as it were exhorting by us. For "Christ, we beseech you, be reconciled to God."§

Our Lord's summed up preaching is in the words: "Do

* I. John iv. 16.

† John iii. 16.

‡ Titus iii. 4.

§ II. Cor. v. 18.

penance, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." His hearers knew what was meant by the kingdom of heaven, which all Jews at that time were expecting. True, for the most part, they interpreted it, like the later Jews, in an earthly and political sense. They dreamed of a Messianic kingdom, surpassing the kingdom of David and Solomon in power and splendour, that would secure to the Jews the empire of the earth. But from the very first Jesus left no doubt that this kingdom was one of truth and forgiveness of sin, and not a kingdom of this world.

His Messianic character he avowed publicly only to the woman at Jacob's well, where he took occasion to explain that the hopes for the coming Messias should be entertained only in a spiritual sense. When among his disciples he approved of Peter's confession he charged them to tell no man. The numerous prohibitions to those healed shows how anxious Jesus was to avoid encouraging the false hopes of the Jews respecting the Messias.

Thus it was a most difficult task to found a spiritual kingdom on earth, and to enlist in its favour faith and obedience. Only by slow degrees could the Jews and even the disciples grow accustomed to ideas such as these. In the prologue to St. Matthew's Gospel the forgiveness of sins is indicated as the chief purpose of the Redeemer. Again, in the sermon on the mount, Jesus, as his precursor had done, demanded a complete change of heart. The eight beatitudes form, as it were, the charter of the new kingdom. In contrast to the sensual views of the Jews, the poor in spirit, the meek, the mourners, they that hunger and thirst after justice, the merciful, the pure of heart, peacemakers and the persecuted are blessed, for they shall be comforted and be filled, they shall possess the land and see God, and theirs is the kingdom of heaven. The beatitudes look beyond the earthly status of the Messianic kingdom. Here, too, heaven and earth, the human and divine are mingled and made one.

Eternal life begins here on earth. It is won by faith, confirmed by hope, and in charity perfected. "The kingdom of God is . . . justice and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."* God himself is the model in the new kingdom. "Be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father is also perfect." The disciples will be hated by the world. Their conversation should be in heaven, while they themselves sojourn on earth. To Cæsar must be rendered the things that are Cæsar's, but to God the things that are God's.

By these maxims the new kingdom is made independent of state and nation. It can and will embrace all peoples to the ends of the earth, because it rests on the moral basis of the love of God and our neighbour. As all men pray to the Father in heaven for daily bread and forgiveness of sins, so all likewise pray that God's name may be hallowed and his kingdom come. God's will is your sanctification, and charity is the whole law: these are the two dominating principles of Christian life that converted and renewed the ancient world, and sanctified the individual, the family and society. The individual is sanctified, inasmuch as not only external actions but thoughts and intentions have a moral value; his actions again are ennobled by their motives. The individual is now no longer considered as a mere unit in the state, but as one who has an immortal soul ransomed by the precious blood of Jesus Christ. He is worth more than all the world. "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his soul?"

The sanctification of the individual must needs conduce to the sanctification of the community. The basis of all society is marriage. How this was despised and violated by the heathen we have already seen. Polygamy, the institution of slaves and concubines, and shameless lasciviousness, in the name of religion, are a sad proof. Even among the Jews marriage was not preserved altogether inviolate. On account of their hard-

* Rom. xiv. 17.

ness of heart Moses had allowed husbands to put away their wives by a bill of divorce. In course of time divorces became more readily obtained. Jesus shows himself to be the divine redeemer by restoring marriage to that primitive purity and indissolubility which God had instituted from the beginning. "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." The disciples cannot understand this strict law, and say, if this be the case with man and wife, it is not good to marry; but Jesus answered, "Not all take this word, but to whom it is given," that is, to those who have the Christian faith and God's grace. To the natural and sensual man devoid of grace, this indissolubility of marriage, which conduces to restraint, seems irksome and impossible; but not so to the man of faith, enlightened by the heavenly spirit of Christianity, and strengthened by grace. To him such moral perfection, and contempt for the things of earth and sense, do but secure the goal of his efforts, life eternal.[15]

For this reason Jesus surrounded marriage with the protection of chastity. The external command "Thou shalt not "commit adultery" he traced back to its deepest ground. "I "say to you, that whosoever shall look on a woman to lust after "her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart."* As of old the covenant of Jahve with his people was set forth under the figure of marriage, so now the union of Christ with his church, the ideal of all religious union, is represented by Christian marriage. "Be subject to one another in the fear of "Christ. Let women be subject to their husbands as to the "Lord, because the husband is the head of his wife, as Christ "is the head of the Church. He is the Saviour of his body. "Therefore as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let "the wives be to their husbands in all things. Husbands, love "your wives, as Christ also loved the Church and delivered "himself up for it, that he might sanctify it. . . . For this

15 Möhler, *l. c.* I. 189.

* Matth. v. 28.

"cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall "cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. This "is a great Sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the "Church." *

From this point of view we are able to see how holy marriage has been rendered by the Christian religion. So henceforth it became possible for the Apostle to allow even mixed marriages to stand, because the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife by the believing husband. Our Lord himself connected together in his teaching his doctrines of marriage and of virginity, and S. Paul in his Epistles does the same. Jesus not only insisted on the indissolubility of marriage; he went further, and enjoined under certain circumstances, complete continence. "For there "are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the "kingdom of heaven. He that can take let him take it." No sane man would suggest here a literal interpretation, but the spiritual interpretation will lead of necessity to the doctrine of voluntary restraint for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. It does not contravene the doctrine of the sacredness of marriage, but it suggests a higher state of perfection for those to whom it is given by God to pass their lives wholly in the service of the Lord, and to take as their model not Martha with her homely carefulness about many things, but the contemplative Mary. We have seen that the God-man set the example himself. The disciples copied it in their way; for we are not aware that any of them married after entering the service of our Lord; but we know that every one of them left all things and followed him; and what Jesus meant by "all things" we learn from his own words: "There is no man who hath left "house or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children for the "kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive much more in "this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting." *

* Eph. v. 32.
* Luke xviii. 29.

The "woman" or "sister" mentioned in I. Cor. ix. 5 does not prove that the Apostles went on their missionary journeys with their wives. All the ancient writers took for granted that John whom the Lord loved was a virgin. Concerning virgins S. Paul gives a counsel not a command of the Lord, but thinks that he has received from the Lord the grace to be faithful. The drift of this counsel is that it is good for man to be able to remain even as he, and that the married should live as the unmarried. The undivided service of God is above earthly considerations. "It is indisputable," says Weizsäcker, "that "the Apostle sets out with the conviction that virginity ranks "higher than the married state."[16] Voluntary continency is to be esteemed holy, and hence the glorious state of virginity is to be honoured. In course of time virginity like widowhood became a widespread institution in the Church. Anyone reading the spirited panegyrics of the Fathers, Chrysostom, Basil, Ambrose and others on virgins consecrated to God, must feel convinced that the Church has in this, solved not only a religious and moral, but even a great social problem. How powerful is the contrast drawn by S. Ambrose between the Vestal virgins of Symmachus and the choirs of Christian virgins!

As the virginity of our Lord, so also his poverty became a pattern for his disciples. Jesus does not reject all possessions, but only the restless striving after riches and the attachment to them. "Lay not up to yourselves treasures on earth, where the rust and moth consume, and where thieves break through and "steal . . . For where thy treasure is, there is thy heart "also . . . You cannot serve God and mammon. There- "fore I say to you: Be not solicitous for your life, what you "shall eat, nor for your body what you shall put on."* "Seek "ye therefore first the kingdom of God, and his justice, and

16 Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 691.
* Matth. vi. 29. seq.

"all these things shall be added unto you."* How far reaching are the consequences of these doctrines for rich and poor, for religion, the church, the family and the state! Heathen philosophers despise the poor labourers and slaves, and when they can no longer make money out of them leave them to their fate. They seem beings of a lower order, about whom the gods care nothing. No wise man allows the reproach of such company to attach to his house.[17] The Christian knows that earthly goods are only entrusted to him to be used as means of salvation, that he may lay up treasures in heaven; that he is a steward of the goods committed to him, and that he must render an account of his stewardship. Only the merciful shall obtain mercy. The life led by the faithful in Jerusalem was a result of this new teaching; the collections ordered by the Apostles for the poor in Jerusalem, showed that it was understood and practised by all. The poor and slaves, the sick and the miserable, strangers and travellers owed to it the alleviation of their hard lot. As if to supply an antidote to the striving for riches promoted by family ties, immediately after the account of marriage, and blessing of children, Matthew inserts the story of the meeting of Jesus with the rich young man. He did not find it hard to observe the commandments, but felt that there was still something wanting. "If thou wilt be "perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and "thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me." And when the young man, who had great possessions, had gone away sad, Jesus said: "Amen I say to you, that a rich man "shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven . . . It is "easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than "for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven." We may add: He who can take this word, let him take it. Even the disciples wondered at this, saying: "Who then can be

17 *Quint.*, *Declam.* 301, III. 17. Cicero. *Tusc.* v. 36. Macrob., *Saturn.* I. 11. Cf. Orig., *c. Cels.*, iii. 59; viii. 72. Döllinger, *Heidenthum*, p. 722.

* Ibid. vi. 33.

"saved?" As virginity ranks before marriage, so poverty surpasses riches and possessions. Both are requisite for the service of God; both raise man above the inclinations of sense; both are adapted to levelling the inequalites of human society, and to ennoble the kingdom of God. As the Son of God himself led a heavenly life on earth, so he wishes the faithful to conform as far as possible to his image.

So far we have been surveying the Kingdom of God more from the exterior. We have but lightly touched upon the inward power, the principle of life that proceeds from Christ. Whence does the Gospel derive the power to save those who believe, and to set man free from the earth? Man has, so to speak, two souls within him: a heavenly soul that yearns for good and seeks what is above, and an earthly sensual soul that seeks pleasure and enjoyment, and inclines his heart to things here below that are perishable and visible. Who will give him strength to withstand ambitious and covetous inclinations, and temptations to sensuality and pleasure? The teaching of philosophy, the law of man, humanity and popular morality are incapable of quenching the fire of the passions. Says the heathen Thucydides: "*It is wrong and foolish* to suppose, "once the storm of lust has been roused in man, that it can be "quelled by law or any other means."[18] "Unhappy man that I "am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? "The grace of God by Jesus Christ our Lord."* In no name but that of Jesus Christ is it given to men to be saved. The God man, by his example, his teaching and his divine precepts really wishes to save all men and to impart his grace to all; to believers he has given strength to avoid sin and temptation, and to overcome the world. It is grace that gives to man the supernatural power to practise patience, virtue, and self-denial—the grace that Christ merited for us on the Cross. He only who is engrafted as a living branch in the vine can

18 *Histor.* III. 45.
* Romans vii. 24.

bear fruit. Without Jesus we can do nothing. God, according to his good pleasure works in us "both to will and to do." He has begun the good work in us and will complete it. We owe everything to divine grace, whose power is made perfect in infirmity. Christ, the God-man, is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, who is, who was and who will be. To him be honour and power forever and ever. Amen.

CHAPTER XX.

A RETROSPECT.

The road we have passed has been a long one. Although we tried, when treating of the doctrines of creation and redemption, to confine ourselves to the main points at issue leaving out much interesting detail; yet the mass of matter, claiming attention, was still so overwhelming that, in spite of every effort to be clear and concise, the thought is oftener suggested than developed. But the careful reader will have observed that, in the several treatises, special attention was given to logical and orderly development. In the arrangement of the materials I have allowed myself a certain latitude. It was not my intention to write a severely systematic Apology, but one more suited to the general taste. In a text-book, especially a dogmatic text-book, a strictly systematic form is indispensable; but in writings of an apologetic cast, it is preferable not to see the objections and proofs marshalled in rank and order. Still, the connection between the several divisions is not so loose as it might at first sight appear. It will, perhaps, be useful to the reader, if at the close of these two volumes we briefly trace the line of thought running through the whole work.

Under the heading *Apology and Apologetics* the necessity, notion, function, and importance of Apologetic Science are set

forth. Next, in order to give an insight into the historical development and gradual formation of this science, an epitome of the *History of Apologetic Science* follows, supplying an historical basis for a fuller treatment of the introductory matter. But since Apology, as a science, presupposes religion, in Chapter III., *The Universal Fact of Religion* is examined both historically and ethnographically. The enquiry shaped itself, as it were, into a proof of the existence of God *Ex Consensu Gentium*. Accordingly it seems to form the starting-point of an Apology which has to justify and to defend against many attacks, this religious element everywhere present in the nature of man. The more our adversaries strive to refer this undeniable fact to accidental causes and circumstances, external or internal, the more necessary it seems to show the inadequacy of these methods. The controversy about man's idea of religion and the bearing which that idea has upon tradition and upon man's cognition in general, made it natural to speak of two opposite errors: *Traditionalism and Ontologism*. In close connection with these we further considered the value of what is known in the Schools as the *Ontological* argument for the existence of God. The problem being thus clearly stated and the point at issue decided, we were then enabled to proceed to the positive and legitimate proofs for the existence of a divine being, namely God.

This is done with special reference to the results of modern science, to Darwinism in particular and the objections deduced therefrom. As it is here that the principal struggle between the Christian and modern views of the world is brought to an issue, the *cosmological argument* is handled with the greatest care. There are four chief points in which the theory of evolution reveals its inability to explain the universe without a first cause. These four points are, as it were, so many stages in the cosmological argument. (1) *Beginning and end.*—Science takes us to the beginning of things. Men, animals, plants, the earth and the heavenly bodies,—all had a beginning. Is

matter eternal? Development is inconceivable without motion; there is no matter without motion. Whence comes matter set in motion? The second law of Clausius points to a final condition of even temperature, to matter without energy. Are not a final condition and an incipient condition correlatives? Surely, beginning and end demand a higher supernatural cause. (2) *Life.*—Life stands higher than mechanical motion. The attempts to derive it from the inorganic world have so far completely failed. Consequently we are obliged to designate the above-named cause as living and life-giving. (3) *Various forms of life.*—Amid the great diversity of living forms there are two great kingdoms—the vegetable and the animal, which in their minutest forms do indeed manifest great resemblance; nevertheless on the whole animals are distinguished from plants by the power of voluntary movement and sensation. Darwinism, indeed, seeks to bridge over the chasm; but it has never succeeded in adequately explaining the distinction between species and species, or genus and genus, by its laws of variability, inheritance, or what is termed the struggle for life. The gap between the non-sentient plant and the sentient animal thus remains all the wider. Here is one of the riddles that science is seeking in vain to unravel. So we are justified in falling back on our first cause, whose life seems raised above the ordinary process of life. (4) *Man.*—He is the highest in the scale of living beings. Even by his erect stature and his noble features he far surpasses the animal world. Language and reason, intelligence and liberty, self-consciousness and conscience laugh to scorn every merely natural explanation, so much so, that we find this last stage of the cosmological argument to be the weightiest and most decisive. None but a self-conscious, free, personal spirit could give existence to sentient and rational man. And thus by four steps, as it were, we have ascended from the first cause to the personal God of Theism.

But, besides the efficient cause, there is in the universe

likewise a final cause that must not be ignored. The two cross and recross one another, as every effect caused by a rational being is guided by purpose. The evolutionary theory itself has helped to show in the clearest light the fact of design in organic nature. Many of its supporters have further admitted that the evolution of organisms cannot be explained without internal, constitutional causes. Design in the whole universe and in the individual, both in organic and inorganic nature, in plants, animals and man, is well adapted to manifest in its full light the wisdom and goodness of the Creator, the spiritual personality of whom has already been demonstrated. Thus the physico-theological argument completes and strengthens the force of the cosmological. And it again receives a further accession of strength in the moral proof for the existence of God, by the question of design being specially applied to the domain of virtue and reward.

As the "postulate" of the moral argument implies life after death, the *immortality* of the soul had to be made the object of a special enquiry. In this chapter were set forth the universal belief in immortality, and also the metaphysical and moral reasons derived from the nature and activity of the soul. Hence it was necessary to start from life and its principle—the soul, and, again, from the relations of the soul to the body. Once the distinction between body and soul is established, all monistic systems must fall to the ground. Thus we were led to give a connected account of *Monism*.

And here the first part, which was concerned with the natural knowledge of God, might have ended. But it seemed advisable to deduce from the results obtained their natural consequence. This could be done only by including the subject of creation; and it, again, could not be handled without reference to Holy Scripture. The History of Creation, moreover, as given in the Pentateuch, is a subject of particular interest to the apologist in modern times. The study of the different explanations offered with regard to the six days of

creation, led to the conclusion that the theory of *ideal concordance* had most probability on its side. A further paragraph was needed on the *System of the world*, and an historical synopsis of the Ptolemean and Copernican systems, so far as these affected sacred Scripture.

Immediately connected with the history of creation are the further questions as to the *Unity* and *Age* of the human race. Of both Holy Scripture speaks with more or less clearness. This, therefore, was the proper place for dealing with them. The outcome of the enquiry was that the biblical teaching on the unity of the human race, though not yet scientifically proved by modern ethnography and philology, was still rendered exceedingly probable. In regard to the age of the human race, it is all the easier to allow a greater number of years in accordance with the results of archæology and the history of religion, as the bible itself has no fixed system of chronology, and there is considerable divergence in the texts. The story of the *Flood* is connected with both these questions inasmuch as the controversy, as to whether it was universal or partial, is of great moment in judging ethnographical and linguistic researches And thus the limits of the negative matter seemed to be fixed, and the transition marked out for the second volume, the history of revelation.

The subject of the *second volume* is supernatural revelation, especially the revelation through Jesus Christ. Since, however, according to Holy Scripture, supernatural revelation began in Paradise, it was absolutely necessary to follow the track of this primitive revelation through the religion of divers peoples. And at the present day this is a most important duty of the apologist, for the history of religion applies to the origin and growth of belief the same principle that natural science applies to organic life. The Christian view of the world and the evolutionary are in sharp antagonism. After the first chapter introducing the subject generally, the history of religion had to be treated in detail.

The History of Religion follows a downward course. That of the Indo-Germanic tribes, which stand highest, comes first. Hindus, Iranians, Greeks, Romans and Germans follow on in turn. Buddhism serves as a transition to the religions of the South, to the Chinese of the Malay Peninsula, from whom the Hamites (Egyptians) and Semites are not far removed. These latter are of the utmost consequence in the history of revelation, because some are closely connected with the race of the chosen people, to whom revelation was entrusted, and others were for centuries in contact with them. The History of Religion closes with uncivilized races, which cannot be regarded either as the ideal of incorrupt humanity, nor as the semi-brute commencement of the race. Everywhere, however, both among civilized and uncivilized peoples, there has been preserved at least a smouldering ember of ancient religious truth; everywhere at least the negative preparation for the salvation to come had been completed.

A positive preparation, in the strict sense, must come from God. And it is found in the history of Israel, the chosen people. This fact alone would go far to justify the history of the Old Testament. But there is in addition a twofold and weighty reason. On the one hand, rationalist historians of tradition deny the revealed character of the Old Testament; on the other, theologians of the critical school call in question the origin and history of the Canon. For this reason, it was necessary to subject to a searching scrutiny the hypothesis of Graf and Wellhausen, from the point of view both of the History of Religion and of biblical criticism. For only when the revealed character of the Old Testament has been made secure against attacks, can revelation itself be examined more closely. Besides, it must not be forgotten that the consequences of this theory spread to the New Testament. Christianity is said to be not a new revelation, or indeed a revelation at all, but the outcome of religious development, the result of a blending of the Greek spirit with the Semitic religion. The

chapter on the origin of Christianity is intended to meet these objections, and at the same time to point out the relation of Christianity to other religions. And, thus, it is most clearly shown that the religious truth of the Old and New Testament, with its practical bearings and moral effects, can only be explained by divine revelation.

The meaning of revelation, and its possibility, necessity, kind, and manner had then to be expounded. Next its bearing on human knowledge made it incumbent under the heading *Reason and Revelation* to explain the *Criteria* of revelation, that is, *Miracles and Prophecies* as they are motives for faith in a divine revelation. The miracles of Christianity in the spiritual life, in overcoming internally and externally the heathen sinful world naturally follow. The antipathy of the modern world to the supernatural has called these criteria of revelation much into requisition. Hence it was indispensably necessary to examine closely, with special reference to the natural knowledge of the present day, how far miracles are either possible or knowable. The importance of the prophecies led further to a closer examination of the spirit of the Old Testament revelation. As, in this, it was necessary to start with the received Canon, it became necessary to treat both in general and in particular the question of the credibility of Holy Scripture. And thus was laid the ground-work for the life of Jesus Christ. Credibility was proved both by the history of the Canon, and by testimonies of the Fathers and doctors of the Church to Holy Scripture as a whole and as to its several parts. In deciding this question it is of the utmost importance to understand clearly both the nature and extent of inspiration. An exact distinction between what is of faith and morals and side-matter, between things sacred and profane, is not merely founded on Holy Scripture itself and deduced from its purpose, but is likewise required by the advance of secular science. The boundary is ill-defined, and on many points the reader and the commentator will be left in painful uncertainty and suspense. Hence pru-

dence is required in *interpreting* the sacred Scriptures in the sense in which they were inspired. Without the "Spirit of the Church" no absolute certainty in matters of faith is possible.

As the groundwork of the life of Christ, the *Gospels* containing his glad tidings require special treatment. The relation of the Synoptic Gospels to one another and to the Gospel of S. John forms the "Gospel-question," which, for a hundred years, has held the chief place in New Testament criticism. The hypothesis of Griesbach and the Mark-hypothesis are efforts to solve by the dependence-hypothesis the Synoptic problem which the Tradition-hypothesis avoids. A fusion of the two, after the example of S. Augustine, has the greatest weight of probability in its favour. The credibility and genuineness of the fourth Gospel, are of supreme importance for the life of Christ and for any estimate of his character. These, then, are the materials for the life of Christ, from the crib at Bethlehem to the ascension from the Mount of Olives. The biblical doctrine concerning the *person* and *nature* of Christ is set forth, and in particular it is shown that the doctrine of his *divinity* is attested by both Gospels and Epistles. The formal proofs for his divinity are given in the chapter on the *doctrine and work of Christ*. In a further section the condition of the two natures and their mutual relations are studied, though not so fully as would be done in a treatise of Dogmatic Theology. Together with this we had also to consider the entire significance of Christ's sufferings and death.

Thus the Apology for Christianity, in its strictest sense, is concluded. It forms the introduction and groundwork of the Apology for the *Church of Christ*.

FINIS.